DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 825 TM 830 008

AUTHOR Crawford, Patricia; And Others
TITLE Determination of Policy Awareness and Use of Early Identification Procedures. Research Report [and] Technical Appendix.
INSTITUTION North York Board of Education, Willowdale (Ontario).
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 104p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Ability Identification; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Diagnosis; *Educational Policy; Evaluation Criteria; Foreign Countries; *Handicap Identification; Learning Readiness; Principals; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Questionnaires; School Personnel; Student Needs; Teacher Response
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

The North York Board of Education established an Early Identification Committee, as directed by the Ministry of Education in 1978, to develop procedures for early identification of children's learning needs and abilities. An initial examination of how Early Identification Procedures were being received in the schools is presented, assessing the awareness of elementary school administrators, junior kindergarten-through-grade 3 teachers, and relevant support personnel regarding the procedures. Questionnaires, interviews, and classroom visits were used to determine the extent of program implementation in North York schools. The discussion focuses on the major themes expressed by the groups and highlights specific responses, while the "technical appendix" presents detailed tables summarizing response data from questionnaires and interviews on awareness of procedures, implementation, and modification and resources needed. Principals were found to be the most knowledgeable about the specific procedures. Generally primary teachers were more satisfied with the program than kindergarten teachers. All groups indicated that more time, smaller primary classes, more in-class volunteers and teachers aides, and more professional development and workshops would facilitate the program. (CM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED224825

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# DETERMINATION OF POLICY AWARENESS AND USE OF EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
P. Crawford
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Patricia Crawford
Susan Steinberg, Phyllis Hymmen

September, 1982

TM 830 008 (1 of 2)

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| BACKGROUND | 1 |
| Ministry Policy for Early Identification Procedures | 1 |
| North York Early Identification Procedures | 1 |
| PURPOSE | 2 |
| METHOD | 3 |
| Development of Questionnaires & Interviews | 3 |
| Classroom Visits | 4 |
| Data Collection Procedures | 4 |
| Interviewers | 5 |
| FINDINGS | 5 |
| PRINCIPALS | 5 |
| Awareness of the Procedures | 6 |
| Extent of Program Modification & Implementation | 10 |
| Resources Needed | 11 |
| TEACHERS | 12 |
| The Questionnaire Results | 12 |
| Awareness of the Procedures | 13 |
| Extent of Program Modification & Implementation | 15 |
| Observation Skills | 15 |
| Record Keeping | 16 |
| Use of Observations & Records in Program Modification | 18 |
| Resources Needed | 19 |
| Changes in the Procedures | 23 |
| Classroom Visits | 24 |
| SUPPORT STAFF | 27 |
| Awareness of the Procedures | 27 |
| Role in Implementation | 28 |
| Resources Needed | 28 |
| Changes Recommended | 29 |
| SUMMARY | 29 |
| APPENDIX A | |
| North York Early Identification Procedures | |

## BACKGROUND

### Ministry Policy for Early Identification Procedures

In December, 1978, a memorandum from the Ministry of Education notified directors of education and principals of schools that, "It is essential to establish what a child's learning needs and abilities are if an education program is to be appropriate to the level of the child's development. This should be done by the school when the child is first enrolled." Accordingly, "By September, 1979, each board in the province shall approve a specific procedure to determine the child's learning needs and abilities when the child is first enrolled or at least by the time the child is beginning a program of studies immediately following kindergarten."[1]

Supplemental memoranda[2] clearly stated the Ministry's expectation that the procedures were to be operational by September, 1981.

> "These procedures are part of a process whereby competent teachers create and modify learning opportunities based upon their assessment of children's learning needs."

A subsequent memo (November, 1981) from the Ministry of Education's Central Ontario region outlined elements characteristic of many Early Identification Procedures, which include such elements as ongoing review of each child's total development; ongoing discussions of all pupils' progress by teachers, principals, parents and resource personnel with the view to making suitable program modification where appropriate; formulating policies which incorporate the special needs of minority group children; and the application of the procedures beyond the primary division.

### North York Early Identification Procedures

In keeping with the Ministry directive, North York established an Early Identification Committee to develop procedures for early identification of children's learning needs and abilities. The Committee's report, Developing Appropriate Programs for Primary Children Through the Early Identification of Learning Needs, recommended and clearly outlined procedures (see Appendix A) which were intended to provide learning environments to meet the individual needs of pupils.

The report was approved by the Board in June, 1979, and distributed to schools for implementation the following September. In March, 1980, a reminder of the Board's directive was sent to Assistant Superintendents of Schools, elementary school principals and regional support teams. This memo, "Early Identification Procedures - An Action Plan Up-Date", contained a review of the procedures and some supplemental information.

---

1 Memorandum 1978-79:15, Early Identification of Children's Learning Needs

2 1979-80:24; 1982:11

In the winter of 1982, senior staff felt it would be timely to learn first hand from teachers, principals, and support staff how the Early Identification Procedures were being received in the schools, and to determine what resource needs, if any, existed.

This study was carried out under the direction of a committee comprised of the following people:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mary Ann Penny | Assistant Superintendent, Curriculum |
| Anne Gibson | Co-ordinator of Curriculum - Primary/Junior Education |
| Marjorie Perkins | Head of Assessment Services & Chief Psychologist |
| Phyllis Hymmen | Research Consultant |
| Patricia Crawford | Chief Research & Evaluation Officer |

## PURPOSE

There were two goals in the initial examination of Early Identification Procedures:

1) to assess the awareness of school administrators, teaching staff and relevant support personnel about North York Early Identification Procedures

2) to determine the extent of the implementation of the procedures in North York schools

The objectives were to:

1) determine how well the Early Identification Procedures are understood and followed by school personnel

2) determine what resource needs exist, if any, for the implementation of the procedures

3) determine what aspects of the process JK-Grade 3 teachers have found most helpful and any recommendations for revisions in the procedures

4) gather the perceptions of principals, special education program leaders, generalist program leaders and psychoeducational consultants regarding the impact of implementation of the procedures

The long range objective is to develop strategies for the longitudinal assessment of the impact of the Early Identification Procedures.

This report deals with the methodology used and the findings obtained for the first phase of the investigation.

## METHOD

A combination of three methods was chosen for collecting data.

1) Questionnaires which allow a relatively large sample to be contacted fairly quickly and economically.

2) Interviews which can provide more comprehensive and in-depth information as the interviewer has the opportunity to ask for clarification and elaboration of responses.

3) Classroom Visits which can also provide for more in-depth qualitative information.

### Development of Questionnaires and Interviews

When the instrumentation was developed, the goal was to ask questions which would enable us:

- to assess the level of awareness of personnel regarding the Early Identification Procedures
- to learn to what extent the procedures were understood and being implemented
- to learn what staff perceived as the strengths and weaknesses of the procedures, how satisfactorily they felt they could implement the procedures in their present format, as well as how much effort the procedures demanded of them
- to learn what resources were needed, if any, which would allow teachers to implement the procedures more effectively

Several meetings were held where the Curriculum and the Research & Evaluation staff explored areas of concern to be included and reacted to the format and content of initial drafts of the questionnaires.

Before the questionnaires were finalized, the teacher questionnaire was pilot tested with a small group of experienced primary school teachers who have been working closely with the Co-ordinator of Curriculum - Primary/ Junior Education to develop resource materials related to the implementation of the Early Identification Procedures. The principal questionnaire was vetted with a principal in a personal interview. Based on their feedback, as well as that of the working committee, revisions were made to simplify and clarify the wording of the questions.

The principal interviews were based on the questionnaire. It was hoped that with an opportunity to talk with principals individually and ask for clarification and elaboration of their answers that we would gain a clearer picture of the extent of implementation of the procedures.

## Classroom Visits

The purpose of the classroom visits was to have an opportunity to discuss with teachers on an individual basis how well they are able to implement the procedures, what changes they would like to see in the procedures and what resources and professional development are needed to help them implement the procedures more effectively. Secondly, the classroom visits provided an opportunity to observe the ways in which teachers systematically record their observations of individual pupil's daily behaviour and to try to ascertain how the teacher uses her records and observations in making program modifications. A maximum of two hours was spent in each classroom.

Two people were hired as classroom observers, one a former North York vice-principal with considerable experience in the primary area and the other a former elementary teacher.

## Data Collection Procedures

In mid-April, prior to distribution of the materials, the Superintendent of Curriculum & Staff Development sent a memo to principals informing them of the study and requesting their co-operation.

In late April and during May, information was gathered in the following ways:

- A random sample of 50% of all JK-Grade 3 teachers received a questionnaire, i.e. 329 teachers.

- 58 principals received a questionnaire, while the remaining 44 principals were invited to participate in an interview with a representative of Educational Research & Evaluation Services. Selection of principals to be interviewed was not entirely random as consideration was given to ensuring that each family of schools had appropriate representation, related to the size of the family.

- All support staff (i.e. 79) received a questionnaire.

- 22 schools were visited for a full day; two classrooms were visited in each school. Classrooms were identified in consultation with the principal from among those teachers who did not have an opportunity to provide input on the questionnaire.

A week after the questionnaires had been distributed a follow-up memo was sent to all participants thanking them for their co-operation if they had already completed their questionnaire or reminding them to complete the questionnaire and return it if they had not already done so.

Interviewers

Four Research & Evaluation Services staff plus the two classroom observers interviewed the principals. A training session was conducted during which they were given material to familiarize themselves with the Early Identification Procedures, as well as some background material explaining the rationale for the study. Discussion included clarification of the questions, how to handle any problems that might arise, how to record information during the interview, as well as a format for writing their responses. On the average each interview required approximately one hour to complete.

## FINDINGS

The results for each group, principals, teachers and support staff, are discussed separately in the sections which follow under three headings:

- Awareness of the Procedure
- Extent of Program Modification & Implementation
- Resources Needed

The discussion focusses on the major themes expressed by each group with regard to these topics and does not present detailed tables summarizing the percentage of people who gave each response for each question in the respective questionnaires. Such tables are available in a separate report entitled Technical Appendix which can be obtained from Educational Research & Evaluation Services. The tables on which each of the following sections are based are noted as a guide for the reader who wishes to study in detail the information gathered.

## PRINCIPALS

Completed questionnaires were returned by 50 of the 58 principals to whom they were sent. Forty-one of the 43 principals who were contacted agreed to be interviewed. The data in this section, therefore, represent the opinions of 91 or 90% of the principals.

Initially, information from the questionnaires and the interviews was analyzed separately but, as similar ideas and trends were expressed in both modes of response, the data have been combined.

The responses to the concept of Early Identification ranged from the very positive:

- the procedures are super
- early I.D. should not be negotiable

to the more critical:

- unrealistic expectations
- procedures are deficiency-based

Principals generally responded positively to the interviews, as reflected in the following two comments: "Thanks for forcing me to think about Early I.D." and "I hope that the time it has taken to do this study can lead to some positive action".

## Awareness of the Procedures*

### General Reactions

The majority of principals (74%) feel that the procedures have heightened the awareness of teachers and principals of the need to identify and respond early to individual pupil needs. Most principals said that they are familiar with the procedures themselves and a few principals stated that, in fact, the procedures didn't represent anything new in their schools. As one described it, "The school had a system of identifying and modifying needs before the procedures were implemented, the formalization spread and broadened their use". Forty percent of the principals feel very satisfied and 41% are satisfied with the existing format of the Early Identification Procedures. While one-third said the procedures are fairly easy to implement, over half (59%) stated that it is difficult, but possible. Comments made by principals reflect their concerns, e.g.

> "The process is draining and exhausting if the procedures are taken seriously. It is an ongoing thing; it cannot be done short term."

> "The procedures have led to an almost institutionalized rather than a passing look at the children."

While the general reactions implied awareness of the procedures, principals did express some concern about how well the procedures are actually working.

> "The overriding factor is numbers and time. One can only implement procedures within the constraints of class size, the amount of time available, and the ability of the staff."

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 1-5, 10, 11, 13

Despite the concerns expressing the difficulty of doing what is outlined in the procedures and the concern that the goals and expectations are somewhat idealistic, there was a positive reaction to the procedures.

> "We have become more aware of the child as a total human being rather than merely using an academic approach."
>
> "The procedures have created a heavy workload in terms of identification meetings and referrals, but when we are successful the payoff is worthwhile in terms of improved pupil self concept and teacher morale."

Some Specific References to the Procedures, Particularly Their Helpfulness

In this section the statements in italics come directly from the recommended procedures for implementing Early Identification in North York.

> *The principal, nurse and junior kindergarten teacher(s) will register all new junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September.*

The registration of new junior kindergarten children is seen as being helpful for providing a context for dialogue between home and school in a supportive situation, and identifying children needing immediate program modification. Help from support people such as the nurse, translators, program leaders and volunteers is seen as invaluable. There is concern, however, that too much importance might be given to this procedure as a tool for diagnosing learning needs for the following reasons: Many parents and children do not come to the formal registration; teachers are not always there; it is too early to provide the "true" picture of the child; the high degree of staff movement decreases its value.

Only 5% of the principals said this procedure has not been implemented in their school as yet.

> *After registration, but not later than September, the principal will chair a screening committee to review each enrolment questionnaire in order to identify children requiring immediate intervention and program modifications.*

Of those principals who use this procedure, almost all consider it to be helpful; however, 24% reported that they have not yet implemented this procedure in their school. The most frequently mentioned comments reflect a concern about timing. Twenty-six percent of the respondents caution that September is too early to identify needs and plan for intervention.

Some principals feel that there is no need for a formal committee and conduct this review informally. Others mentioned that they use this procedure primarily to flag extreme problems rather than to review all children.

*Principals will co-ordinate a comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade two.*

Eighty percent of the principals view the comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade 2 as helpful. Many, however, have suggested their own modifications to this procedure, e.g.

- . not always done for all children at these levels
- . done routinely at all levels
- . is part of the annual review
- . is an ongoing process throughout the year

The comprehensive review provides information which is used as the basis for planning subsequent program modification and identifying what resource help is needed, thus reducing the number of students moving to the junior division whose needs have not been addressed. Fifteen percent have not yet implemented this procedure.

*Principals will ensure an annual review of all students, involving outside resource personnel when desirable.*

Eighty-seven percent of principals find the annual review helpful. Of the remaining 13%, 4% do not find it helpful, 4% have not yet implemented this procedure and 5% did not answer this question.

Many principals (20%) consider this an ongoing process and not just a once a year review. They feel that this approach is critical for establishing good programing.

Benefits resulting from the annual review include: Ensuring evaluation for all; assessing progress; planning and reviewing program modification; keeping records up-to-date; and providing an opportunity for information and idea sharing.

A variety of resource personnel may be involved in this process, for example, program leaders, child care workers, nurse, Dellcrest staff, consultants for reading, speech, special education, E.S.L., and psychoeducational consultants.

*Teachers will*
*modify programs to answer the needs identified at review (meetings)*
*observe daily student health, behaviour and development*
*keep records of general development, language and behaviour*
*develop appropriate programs to answer the observed needs of their students*

*Teachers will meet the individual needs of their students in program planning and modification.*

The majority of principals feel that teachers observe students regularly, keep records and usually modify and/or develop programs to respond to observed needs of their students.

Record keeping evoked the most comment. Principals report that the form and extent of record keeping varies considerably from teacher to teacher. Some principals feel that it is an unrealistic expectation to expect teachers to keep formal records for all students.

In terms of the impact of the procedures on the schools, 74% of the principals feel that implementation of the procedures has made staff more aware of the need to identify and respond to individual pupil needs. About one-third made reference to improvement in program planning and in meeting individual needs of students, one-fifth spoke of shared responsibility by teaching staff and support staff of assessing problems, and implementing appropriate program modification.

Some Concerns and Some Suggestions for Change

Although generally the procedures are viewed as helpful, principals do have some criticisms as well as suggestions for changes. The following comments are representative:

. Some schools are doing too much before school begins. The procedures should not be too formalized and too structured. You must see students in the learning context before they can be evaluated. Basing program modification on what is learned about the child before school begins is ridiculous! The front end of the procedures should be more flexible and less formalized. Emphasis should be on ongoing evaluation and programing.

. We need to have the screening committee later in the fall term when teachers have had an opportunity to work with the children in the learning environment.

. We need more optional ways of doing the procedures, depending on the principals' style, teachers' skills and students' needs.

. The procedures are deficiency based - the negatives are emphasized and learned about rather than the strengths. That's scarey. I would like to see a greater emphasis on the developmental and more positive aspects of the children - on working with the strengths. The tone is still special education.

. We need to revise the enrolment questionnaire so that it asks more realistic questions.

. We should consider dropping the idea of reviewing all students for now. It does not make sense to do every procedure for every student. It is unrealistic to expect this.

. We should develop a standard form for collecting information.

- Less emphasis should be placed on formal meetings, assessment, and more emphasis should be placed on developing a more informal, ongoing process (which will vary from school to school). The approach is seen as systematic, but one which allows flexibility and different and creative approaches in different contexts, depending on school size, student needs and skills of staff.

- Energy needs to go into helping staff work collaboratively in an ongoing way within the classroom and decreasing time spent in so many meetings outside the learning environment.

- We need to build in greater resources as well as better distribution and use of resources, e.g. adequate release time for meetings, more "in the classroom" support, smaller classes

- We need professional development workshops on the process, e.g. on observation, record keeping, program modification.

## Extent of Program Modification & Implementation*

Principals were asked to comment on both the skills and strengths they see their teachers using in implementing Early Identification as well as additional skills which they feel their teachers need in order to implement Early Identification Procedures. There was considerable variability from principal to principal in their responses to these questions reflecting the range of skills and experiences of their teachers. Strengths that teachers have include sensitivity to children's needs, flexibility in dealing with children, observation and diagnostic skills, ability to modify expectations and programs to meet the needs of individual children.

The most difficult part of implementing the Early Identification Procedures, however, seems to rest in the area of program modification. Principals are saying that the first step is to help teachers to better understand the process of program modification and implementation. This step is a necessary prerequisite to working on improving the skills needed to create and implement programs to meet the individual and different needs of their students.

> "More clarification is needed of what it means to modify programs appropriately by the teacher - it is 75% of the process."
>
> "We are good at identifying the problems, but even experienced teachers need help in modifying programing to meet the needs and in effectively implementing appropriate programs."

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 5, 6, 9

In order to increase their understanding, principals suggest that teachers need more help in actually "doing the process". Resource personnel can help best by spending more time in the classroom helping teachers learn first hand how to assess learning needs, observe their students, modify programs appropriately and re-assess learning needs.

## Resources Needed*

Consideration of the resources required for Early Identification includes discussion of people (i.e. principals, support staff, medical staff, paraprofessionals and parents), materials, and time. The majority of principals (59%) feel that their present resources allow them to implement the procedures only to a moderate extent.

### Personnel

Principals themselves are an important resource in implementing Early Identification Procedures and their responses reflect a broad range of skills, perceptions, and attitudes.

Seventy-four percent of principals feel that support staff are usually available to provide help and are helpful in assessing students, providing workshops and professional development, and working with teachers and individuals.

> "They are super in working with teachers in developing variations in programing."
>
> "Support staff have helped get away from isolated classes and withdrawal programs and moved toward school support for the children."
>
> "The more they work with the teachers, the more skilled and confident the teachers become in handling all children and their needs."
>
> "They have been the main source of program modification ideas, but they are too thinly spread."

Eighty-nine percent of the principals spoke highly of the significant contribution that the school nurse has made in helping to implement the procedures and many elaborated on the nurse's role, e.g. attending meetings; collecting, interpreting and sharing relevant information; making contacts with agencies; offering advice; home visitations and liaison; assisting with registration; compiling health history and records; testing.

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 7, 8, 12

Some principals expressed concern that due to time constraints, nurses are not always available to share information or contact families. The high turnover of nursing staff and restrictions on the information which they can divulge can also be sources of frustration. Some principals also suggested there is a need on a regular basis for other medical resources and dentists in the schools.

Several principals spoke of the need to make better use of parents, reminding us that they are an important resource. The contact between home and school is crucial for effective implementation of the procedures; time must be found to do this effectively.

Principals also mentioned the lack of available and appropriate personnel to supervise classrooms during activities such as registration, review meetings, team meetings, and to "free teachers so they can better their skills within the classroom and during the day". Several principals mentioned that they take over teaching responsibilities in order to release JK teachers for registration.

### Materials

Some principals spoke of budget cuts affecting the resources of equipment and materials. In order to implement the procedures the schools need appropriate and up-to-date materials and equipment.

### Time

Many principals mentioned time constraints placed on all personnel which decrease the effectiveness of how the procedures are being implemented. Some referred to needing more time spent in the classroom by support staff and the nurse; others referred to how time consuming the many review meetings are. Perhaps, as a few suggested, helping personnel to make better use of the time available to them could result in more effective implementation of the procedures.

## TEACHERS

The perceptions, reactions and suggestions of teachers to Early Identification Procedures were gathered through questionnaires and discussions during the classroom visits. The information gathered is presented separately in the sections which follow.

### The Questionnaire Results

Completed questionnaires were returned by 147 (45%) of the 329 teachers to whom they were sent. Eight of the returns could not be tallied because either the teacher was no longer teaching in the primary grades or the

return was received after the analysis was completed. As a result, the findings reported represent 61 kindergarten teachers and 78 primary teachers.

## Awareness of the Procedures*

Teachers were asked to rate the procedures in terms of their perception of how helpful they are in identifying student learning needs. If teachers had not been involved in a particular procedure, they were asked to indicate which of the following reasons applied:

- the procedure did not apply to their grade
- they were unaware of the procedure
- they were aware of the procedure, but it is not being followed in their school

Two procedures, pertaining to junior kindergarten registration and the screening committee, did not involve primary teachers and so the results summarized below represent the extent to which kindergarten teachers found them helpful. The reader is cautioned to remember that these results are based on a very small sample of teachers.

*The principal, nurse and junior kindergarten teacher(s) will register all new junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September.*

Nineteen or 31% of the 61 teachers could not provide a rating of the helpfulness of the junior kindergarten registration as they had not been involved for the following reasons:

- 10 were senior kindergarten teachers for whom the procedure was not applicable
- 4 were aware of the procedure, but reported that it is not followed in their school
- 4 were junior kindergarten teachers not directly involved in junior kindergarten registration

Of the remaining 42 teachers, 17 (40%) find the procedure very helpful, 16 (38%) find it helpful and 9 (21%) find it not too helpful.

*After registration but not later than September, the principal will chair a screening committee to review each enrolment questionnaire in order to identify children requiring immediate intervention and program modifications.*

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10

Forty-three (70%) of the kindergarten teachers indicated that they were not involved in this procedure and so were unable to give a rating. Approximately one-third of them were unaware of the procedure, one-third were aware but reported it is not followed in their school and the remaining third did not answer the question. Of the 18 people who did rate the procedure, 12 found it helpful.

*Principals will co-ordinate a comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade two.*

Two-thirds of the 139 teachers who returned a questionnaire did not rate the helpfulness of this procedure for the following reasons:

- 33 felt it did not apply to their grade
- 34 were unaware of the procedure
- 20 reported it is not followed in their school
- 6 did not answer

Of the 46 who did rate it, 43 find it helpful in determining student learning needs.

Teachers were also asked how helpful the information learned at the comprehensive review is in making program modifications. Of the 46 teachers involved, 40 find it of some help, while six do not.

As is evident, most teachers are unfamiliar with this procedure. As you will recall, 80% of the principals reported this procedure as helpful, although many did point out that it overlaps with the annual review. The distinction between the comprehensive review and the annual review is not clear to teachers.

*Principals will ensure an annual review of all students, involving outside resource personnel when desirable.*

Thirty-eight percent (53) of the teachers have not been involved in an annual review. Half of these teachers (24) were unaware of the procedure, 23 said it is not implemented in their school and six said it does not apply to their grade.

Of the 86 teachers who have participated in the annual review process, 33 (38%) find it to be very helpful and 41 (48%) find it to be helpful in determining student learning needs. Twelve teachers (14%) did not find it helpful.

In terms of making modifications in program, information received at the annual review is perceived to be very helpful by 25 (29%) teachers, helpful by 33 (38%) teachers and not helpful by 22 (25%) teachers.

It is evident, then, that teachers who are involved in the annual review find it of more help in *identifying* student learning needs than in *modifying programs* to accommodate individual student needs.

The procedures related to teacher observation and record keeping are discussed in the next section on program modification.

In terms of implementing the Early Identification Procedures, 45% of the kindergarten teachers feel that they are "fairly easy to implement" as compared with 22% of the primary teachers. Fifty-nine percent of the primary teachers indicated that implementation is "hard work but possible".

When asked to express their satisfaction with the format of the procedures, 38% of the kindergarten teachers and 60% of the primary teachers indicated satisfaction. Of the remaining teachers, 33% of the kindergarten and 19% of the primary teachers said they were dissatisfied; 10% of each group said the procedures have not yet been implemented in their school and the remaining teachers did not answer the question.

In summary, it would seem that as a group, teachers are far less aware of and familiar with Early Identification Procedures than are principals.

## Extent of Program Modification & Implementation

Information gathered through teacher observation, record keeping, and review meetings contributes to planning modifications in program to meet individual student needs. Before looking at specific instances of program modification described by teachers, teachers' perceptions of their observation skills and record keeping procedures is examined.

It should be noted that while many teachers have indicated that they are unfamiliar with the formal processes associated with the Early Identification Procedures, teachers are regularly engaged in using their observation and record keeping skills in planning and implementing their programs.

### Teacher Observation Skills*

The majority of both kindergarten and primary teachers report that they are able to utilize their observations fairly well in individualizing program and they feel comfortable in creating individual pupil programs.

Typically, teachers observe a variety of activities related to health and general classroom behaviour including personal appearance, hygiene, attendance, work habits, and ability to participate in various group sizes using a range of materials.

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Table 6

Some teachers acknowledge that their observations are often "recorded" mentally except in cases of severe problems. "Mostly I make a mental note, but if I suspect neglect, I get down dates and problems I have noticed in my day book". Other teachers, however, follow more systematic methods, e.g. concentrating on each individual once a month. Most observations take the form of anecdotal notes, but often brief daily observations are made on each child using checklists indicating tasks chosen and completed. These are dated and those using them stress the importance of a regular frequent system which enables them to see new and old patterns and to zero in on problems students might be having. For example, as one teacher noted, systematic records allow me "to see patterns of behaviour and correlate them with events in child's home or at school and provide a record of growth of particular skills especially in areas of difficulty".

Only a few teachers mentioned that their observations are haphazard and occur whenever they get the chance.

Record Keeping*

The majority of teachers (84%) feel that record keeping is helpful in facilitating the development of programing which reflects the individual needs in their class.

Although teachers acknowledge that records can be helpful in developing individual programs, they are not quite as positive about their ability to use records for this purpose. This was particularly so among kindergarten teachers.

Typically, collected records include work samples, test results, checklists, and information on contacts with parents and resource staff. An individual file or folder for each child is the most popular means of storing information, although some teachers prefer keeping class folders or notebooks on specific subject areas, e.g. art and creative writing folders.

Work samples are an important part of the records and teachers collect them on a weekly or monthly basis. Sometimes children keep their own work folders. In junior kindergarten where many want to take their work home, some teachers keep work for only short periods of time until the quantity and quality is noted.

Just over half of the teachers had suggestions for materials and resources which they feel would be helpful in further developing their record keeping systems. The most frequent suggestion related to time. There is not enough time to sit down, observe and record on a regular basis. One teacher commented, "Usually you notice important things when you are most busy".

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Table 19

One suggestion proposed as a solution for the problem of time is an increase in the number of teacher aides available. They could be used to file and record or to assume some responsibility for classroom activities, freeing the teacher to observe and record. As one teacher wrote, "Unless extra concrete help in the form of extra people, 'aides', is available, the help is well meant but not sufficient".

The next most frequently mentioned suggestion is for workshops or professional development which would introduce effective, time-efficient methods and provide more specific information on interpreting guidelines in practical program modification. Examining, discussing and witnessing actual methods is also desired by many.

> "I would like to see two or three systems that are being carried out by teachers, i.e. actually are being done and are very successful at it. None of the hypothetical cases, but a factual one."

Other suggestions include the following:

> "More time to evaluate what has happened in the development of a student during a period of time. The report card sessions are the times when I am forced to compile and assess what development has taken place. However, surely program modification days (at least one a term would be reasonable) would be used appropriately if strategies for improving and assessing record keeping were available."
>
> "More Board-supplied materials would also provide some shortcuts."
>
> "More materials - things that do not require two hours each night to prepare."
>
> "A formally devised record card might make recording neater and more interesting for teachers: A desk top file box with easy access."
>
> "A standard set of guidelines on a printout which actually says what samples to be retained."
>
> "Information on home and background on registration forms. It is often embarrassing to ask for this kind of information at parent/teacher interviews."
>
> "Preprinted checklists with things on what to observe, and standard size wide file folders."

## Use of Observations & Records in Program Modification*

Several questions asked teachers to describe how they use information from review meetings, their observations and records in modifying their program to meet the needs of an individual child.

As reported in the earlier section on Procedures, two-thirds of the teachers indicated that they had not been involved in comprehensive review meetings and 38% of the teachers had not been involved in the annual review meetings. Consequently, not all of the teachers could comment on program modifications made as a result of information gained at such meetings.

Among those who have participated in such reviews, the opportunity to discuss the problems of an individual child with other teachers as well as resource staff often results in valuable advice concerning appropriate program modifications. For example:

- revising expectations to be more in keeping with the child's level of development
- changes in the nature of activities and assignments
- changing the class schedule to provide more opportunities for activities such as development of motor skills, fine or large muscle development, art and other creative activities
- children being assessed and referred to appropriate special programs, e.g. E.S.L., enrichment
- contacting parents to seek their co-operation in establishing expectations and routines consistent with those of the school

A few teachers were critical of the review meetings and felt they gained little from them for reasons such as lack of feedback, disclosure of little information regarding both assessment testing and program modification.

One teacher described the feedback she received as all too often "a rehash of known data", adding that "suggestions for specific program modification are usually less than precise and often naive from an instructional design perspective".

Finally, one teacher labelled the comprehensive review as just "another piece of paperwork", arguing that "if a teacher's individual record keeping is good and the written report is specific and informative, why is this [the review meeting] necessary?".

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 4, 5, 6, 7

Teachers use their observations and records to modify programs for groups of children as well as individual children. As one teacher noted:

> "My recording skills help me know the range of skills I am dealing with and I can put out a variety of activities for all thereby providing a stimulating, challenging atmosphere for all."

In terms of individual program modification, records help show behavioural patterns and work habits. For example, one teacher describes behaviour modification made after "observing negative attention seeking devices, altering the response for these by focussing on the positive and minimizing the occasions for negative response".

Likewise with work habits, one teacher's records "reveal areas where a child is not participating. I try to find out why he does not do the activity. Often he feels insecure working with that media or activity, so I work along with him and we do it together. Through communicating in this way I try to build his confidence."

Teachers attend not only to major problems but try to resolve minor ones as well. Such modifications are made usually without notes shortly after observation. This kind of program modification relies on a "flexible classroom set up".

> "I do not write up the problem until it is resolved. In this sense written records are not too helpful in developing a program."

> "Reviewing work samples or checking a sequence of tests can show by repetition of errors if skills or a certain concept need to be retaught to the individual."

Besides showing the child's problems, records reveal the child's main interests, which are incorporated into his/her program to ensure a more interesting and, therefore, successful program. Custom-made programs also involve designing or purchasing special texts or workbooks for exceptional pupils.

Beyond their private use of records for program modification, a few teachers summarize their records and observations and put them into the pupil's O.S.R. file. Many others use them as the basis for discussing problems with parents or consulting with support staff.

## Resources Needed

### Personnel

Implementation of Early Identification Procedures is dependent upon help from various sources. Teachers were asked if they are getting the help they need from the school nurse, the principal, other teachers, support staff. Generally, as indicated in the following table, teachers feel they usually get the help they need from these sources.

| | | | Usually % | Some-times % | Never % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | Are you getting the information and co-operation you need from the school nurse? | K | 65 | 29 | 0 | 5 |
| | | P | 65 | 19 | 10 | 5 |
| b) | Are you getting the support you need (e.g. appropriate meetings) from your principal? | K | 69 | 25 | 0 | 6 |
| | | P | 72 | 18 | 5 | 5 |
| c) | Do you receive help from teachers in your school when you need it? | K | 81 | 11 | 2 | 5 |
| | | P | 78 | 17 | 1 | 5 |
| d) | Are you getting appropriate help from support staff when you need it? | K | 67 | 23 | 0 | 10 |
| | | P | 70 | 26 | 0 | 4 |

There were some exceptions to this pattern. A few teachers elaborated on their ratings by writing in comments. The following are illustrative:

> "The information that the nurse spends so much time gathering at registration is not always passed on to the classroom teacher. I did not have any consultations with the school nurse as we do not seem to have one assigned to our school on a regular basis."
>
> "Early I.D. is not really a priority in the early years as support staff is taken up with older children while adopting a wait and see attitude with junior and senior kindergarten."
>
> "The psychologist will not test senior kindergarten children, yet some kind of special help is needed, even if only informal."

Those who feel there is insufficient resource help attribute it to a number of factors. For example, the part-time schedule of some teachers prevents establishing a good flow of communication between the two parties. "When only teaching half-time, I often don't get to see the nurse and the support staff", and again, "my problems experienced with Early Identification implementation are due to moving from school to school each year". "An efficient program in Early Identification requires a person in full-time capacity in the school."

Professional Development*

Forty-four percent of kindergarten teachers and 29% of primary teachers have attended workshops as part of professional development on Early Identification. Those who had were asked to elaborate on what they had found helpful and what skills they had learned. Despite a limited response, 27 people (the majority of those who answered) described the workshop as a good introduction on observation and recording methods. They learned "how to keep meaningful records on each child", "to speak only in terms of observable behaviour". One teacher remarked, "I was amazed at how much I overlook or take for granted!". Another learned "grouping skills". Many enjoyed discussing methods and exchanging ideas. Generally, the workshop was a "reinforcing of the program in progress". Other things that were helpful included:

> "Take home material, e.g. workshops given by Audrey Glassford, Anne Gibson and Ralph Ingleton."
>
> "Seeing records developed by other boards."
>
> "Assessment techniques elaboration."
>
> "Discussion of program by teachers in special areas (reading, language and speech, etc.)."

A few had more critical comments.

> "Too much time was wasted on general vague philosophy and formalities of testing versus practical topics."
>
> "As usual there is a tendency to run out of time when the nitty gritty day-to-day problems are brought up."
>
> "The information was not of a practical nature, it's good to consider philosophical implications, but it would have been nice to have some tools with which to work in the classroom."
>
> "I would like special areas dealt with in-depth. This has been useful in the past. Usually the scope is too broad. I guess the program on observation skills and recording is an example of being specific."

Several teachers commented on the need for follow-up and for consistency across the system.

> "I attended this workshop a number of years ago and inasmuch as nothing was put into practice, I really can't indicate what was helpful or not."

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Table 9

"There was supposed to be a follow-up but it didn't happen."

"I found that the east and west regions had no idea what each other was developing and even within a region there were many splinter groups formed that had no idea that six or more groups in the Board were working on the same thing."

On the whole, teachers perceived the workshops as valuable and felt that they had not only improved their observation and record keeping skills but learned new things as well.

In terms of future workshops, teachers suggested the following:

"Better systems to deal with specific problems while still looking out for 25 children."

"Opportunities to examine sample files and situations and specific programs designed for them."

"More information on making a diagnosis through observation, e.g.

- The concern is how to interpret your observations - so much depends on the child's maturation.

- My main concern with Early Identification programs is that we do not label children who are late bloomers - children with normal learning ability but later to develop. With children in each class sometimes chronologically a year apart, do we allow them to develop naturally without undue stress to them? Hopefully with teachers' keen observation skills and an updated knowledge of child development, this will happen and we will not label these late bloomers.

"Workshops on P.D. days; 4-8 p.m. workshops were too exhausting."

"Workshops with <u>all</u> personnel present."

"Sources of family help - much of interview time spent counselling parents on child development and management."

Teachers were asked whether workshops on specific topics would be of interest. The percentage checking each topic listed is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| - program planning | 51% |
| - time management | 45% |
| - record keeping | 39% |
| - observation skills | 36% |
| - utilization of support staff | 30% |

Teachers also indicated which source of help they most preferred:

- in-service training 55%
- discussions with other teachers at their grade level 45%
- personal contact with support staff 35%
- formal staff development in their own school or family of schools 34%

## Changes in the Procedures*

Forty-two percent of the teachers had some suggestions for improvements with regards to Early Identification Procedures. Many indicated a need for a clearer understanding of the procedures and specific guidelines for implementing them.

> "As far as I know, there is no uniformity in the assessment of children. The procedures are left to the teachers. Specific guidelines are needed which can be followed by all teachers in terms of language development, social and emotional development, observational skills, record keeping. Most teachers know what they are looking for, but do not know how to go about it."

Other suggestions included:

> "Early Identification meetings are often too early in the year."
>
> "Early Identification card is too vague and a ridiculous size."
>
> "More sharing needed between teachers, i.e. visits to classrooms."
>
> "Goal is too often to protect the teacher, i.e. records used as evidence in case of trouble from parents, therefore, emphasis is not always on the child."
>
> "I think what will show up in the results of the survey is how little is being done in some (probably too many) schools. Some friends who were also asked to do the survey have said they weren't even aware of the policy and they realized they hadn't being doing anything for Early Identification."

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Table 10

## The Classroom Visits*

Most teachers visited in this study were aware of the Early Identification Procedures. Only one teacher had never heard of the program and even she seemed to be carrying out many of its procedures as part and parcel of good teaching practices. But, it is one thing to say that all teachers are aware of the program, and quite another to say that they all feel comfortable implementing it in their classrooms. While we encountered various degrees of competence - one thing became increasingly evident - teachers lack confidence, they need reassurance that what they are doing or trying to do is on the right track. Many asked for more information, more specific guidelines and more Board supervision. The following questions are typical of those raised:

What is the expected result of the program?

Will it be consistently maintained Board-wide?

How will it's continuity from year to year be encouraged?

Will the program become mandatory?

In those classrooms where teachers are clearly making an effort to implement the procedures we inevitably saw varying degrees of success with respect to observing, recording and program modification. It was interesting to note that in our opinion, the success or failure seemed to depend entirely on the personal initiative of the individual teacher. Some teachers painstakingly perfect their observation and recording skills, attend workshops, read up on methodology, and seek information that will help them develop custom-made programs. In short, they work hard. Others unfortunately don't and in a few instances teachers acknowledged their lack of initiative and self discipline.

Most teachers fell between these two extremes. Recording, for example, is generally quite impressive. All teachers keep some records on each child and most often they are used as reference for reviewing and reporting to parents not particularly for program modification as part of Early Identification. Most of these records take the form of cumulative files. They are filled with work samples, test results, anecdotal notes on things like behaviour, work habits, social relations, interests, health information, any other information from the resource staff, and checklists indicating activities chosen and completed by each child.

Another item often included and referred to as one of the most helpful sources of information is the registration form. Teachers emphasize the importance of a thorough registration questionnaire as a means of getting vital background information on each child. Frequently, registration forms include questions on the child's social background - i.e. language and family situation, any emotional problems, health and perceptual handicaps, medical history, developmental history, i.e. what age did the child walk,

---

* This section is written from the viewpoint of the two classroom observers and reflects their perceptions of the extent to which Early Identification is being implemented.

talk, etc., any past schooling received, and finally, the child's attitude towards school. All of this information helps to familiarize the teacher with the child and consequently saves time in the development of programs to account for individual differences.

Similarly, parent/teacher interviews conducted in early June or the fall are also helpful. One enterprising kindergarten teacher even obtains useful information from the corner day-care centre which many of her pupils attend for the remainder of the day.

The frequency with which teachers note their observations varies with the individual, but in more than half of the classrooms visited, teachers indicated that most daily observations are mental and are only written down as time permits - usually on a weekly basis. Systematic observation and written recording tend to decline as the year progresses. Daily records, if any, are primarily in checklist form indicating activities performed by each pupil. Some teachers use an at-a-glance notebook to jot down noteworthy events during the day. Only with exceptional problems or right before report cards, do teachers make careful written observations.

This does not mean, however, that teachers don't want to do more extensive recording. Their chief problem, however, is one of time. Either there is not enough time in their day for more extensive observing and recording, or they feel that their methods are inefficient. In many classes teacher aides are used for checklist recording and filing daily work samples. In the older grades the students help too. They record their own participation in the daily activities offered.

While many attribute their lack of satisfactory records to the shortage of time which limits the opportunity to observe, and others blame their own inefficient methods, another contributing factor is large classes. One teacher elaborated on the effects of large classes whose numbers exceed quotas set by the Board. The children, she said, have "constant close interaction which leads to turmoil, over-stimulation and reduces the opportunity for observation in any context other than that of a large group".

Teachers are attempting to meet the needs of individual children in a variety of ways. For example, activity centres typically offer a wide selection of activities, featuring various levels of skill development and learning styles. As students begin work on an activity, the teacher spends time observing and working with each child. The child's progress is checked and on-the-spot adaptation can be carried out as the need arises. In this way, slower learners get more time and simpler tasks, while the gifted can be challenged.

Another indication of program modification is the number of special groups formed according to common needs, interests and abilities. In some classes, children are also allowed to move and explore outside the boundaries of their grades. Gifted readers, for example, participate in the next grade's reading program while slower students participate in the lower grade's program.

From grade one up, children in many classrooms are able to control their own program modification - choosing and planning their activities, charting their progress and discussing it with the teacher.

Indication that programs are developed to accommodate the needs of individual children was not evident in each and every classroom visited. In some classes set lessons were being taught to the class which ignored those with different learning styles and needs. Sometimes this seemed to be caused by the teacher's insistence on sticking to her own system of running the classroom, a system designed for the average student, but which allowed little opportunity for creativity. Some teachers felt that there wasn't enough time to create custom-made programs for all. As well, many were faced with large classes. In dealing with such numbers control and discipline unfortunately took priority in the lesson. This resulted in a lack of student participation and feedback on the day's lesson. In a few classrooms compensation for this was made by setting up activity centres where the lesson's concepts could be practised, tested and reviewed if needed. In a few schools, parental pressure is a key variable as parents insist on a highly structured classroom program featuring prescribed writing and reading texts and notebooks. While all these things can hamper the amount of individualized programing, teachers feel they need more help from resource staff - both in and out of class. One teacher felt that although review meetings were good in terms of pinpointing needs, they were of very little help in terms of making the transition from the diagnosis of the problem to the actual program created to solve it.

Teachers expressed some concerns about the program modification card, especially in junior and senior kindergarten. They feel it's use can result in the child being labelled prematurely. They suggested that the card should be revised.

It was obvious that teachers need support from parents, resource staff, principals and other teachers in order to implement Early Identificiation effectively.

There is also a strong need for workshops which will give a clearer indication of what Early Identification is all about and the ways it can be implemented, efficient methods of recording and observing, and specific information on ways to modify program with regards to specific problems. Along with workshops, many teachers are eager to make visits to other classes in order to witness good Early Identification implementation and practices currently in use.

Teachers also mentioned that the Board could be supportive by ensuring that extra help and special classroom materials are readily available. But support takes on one final meaning with regards to the teacher, the Board and Early Identification. In teachers' perception, part of the program's problem is it's vagueness in terms of purpose and future in the North York Board of Education. Teachers want clarification not just of the nitty gritty details and procedures of the program, but also clarification of the Board's long-range intent and purpose for introducing Early Identification.

While all teachers agreed on the value of such a program, teachers want more supervision and Board support for the program to make it uniformly consistent. Teachers need encouragement which comes with knowing that their work is significant not just in terms of their pupil's yearly progress, but in their whole future.

## SUPPORT STAFF

A total of 79 questionnaires were distributed to support staff. Forty-eight (61%) were returned - 26 by psychoeducational consultants and 22 by other consultants and program leaders.

Only the highlights of the data are reported here. They reflect a range of reactions to the Early Identification Procedures and the impact they have had on schools and programs, varying degrees of involvement with schools, a general sense of satisfaction on the part of respondents about their ability to help school staff with the procedures and a strong sense that both teachers and support staff need more training in understanding developmental patterns of children if individual programing is to be effective.

### Awareness of the Procedures*

Support staff generally are aware of all of the procedures though they are not completely satisfied with the format. Fifty-four percent of the psychoeducational consultants and 41% of other support staff expressed dissatisfaction. Despite this, both groups believe that the procedures can be implemented, although it involves a good deal of hard work.

The degree of involvement of support staff with each of the procedures varied considerably from 31% who are involved with particular procedures in all their schools, to 65% who are involved with particular procedures in some schools, to 79% who are not involved in any schools with regard to particular procedures. Almost all support staff help teachers to develop and modify programs for identified pupils. Eighty-five percent also assist with pupil observation.

Generally, support staff feel that implementation of the procedures has heightened the awareness of many teachers and principals about developmental differences and the need for early intervention and "has encouraged many teachers to be more observant and aware - referrals on young children are usually more appropriate than in the past". Implementation has not been without problems, however, and some support staff feel there has been an increase in frustration among teachers because of lack of time, increased paperwork and some confusion and apprehension about what is expected of them.

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 2, 7, 8, 9

## Role in Implementation*

Approximately 25% of teachers and principals seek assistance from support staff "frequently", while half of these two groups do so at least "sometimes".

Nurses generally do not look to support staff for help though 40% of other support staff do so "sometimes". There is a general sense among support staff that when asked for help they have been able to deliver it fairly effectively.

Support staff provide various kinds of help. Most commonly this involves consultation with teachers and follow-up concerning programs for identified pupils, attending Early Identification meetings and yearly reviews, classroom observation, and conducting assessments.

There is an awareness of some shift in role for about two-thirds of support staff. They are playing a much more active role with individual pupils, earlier in the process. One psychoeducational consultant said: "The role change is fairly major - has shifted my assignment load from grades 3-6; more program time in early years" and a generalist noted that: "Now asked to suggest and implement program modifications for individual students ... rather than suggesting teaching strategies for a group or total class". There has also been some increase in consultations and referrals.

## Resources Needed**

Half the respondents feel that their present resources allow them to assist in the implementation of Early Identification Procedures most of the time and 38% feel they are adequate "sometimes". They would like to have a number of additional resources, however.

Topping the list was a desire for more time, followed by further training in child development and strategies for improving academic performance and behaviour, as well as more opportunity for classroom observation. Some support staff would also like to see an increase in paraprofessional help, more special education resource teachers, completion of new guidelines, adoption of a consistent policy and procedures in all schools and greater commitment to the procedures by some principals.

Although support staff feel that about two-thirds of teachers and principals understand the concept of individualized programing for identified children, they are somewhat skeptical about the application in practice with 56% believing that teachers and 48% believing that principals do not apply the concept.

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 3, 4

** Refer to Technical Appendix, Tables 5, 6

A number of suggestions for improving teachers' ability to implement the procedures were made. The most frequently mentioned were the need for workshops, preferably during school hours, on developmental aspects (e.g. behaviour, cognitive), observation techniques and program modification; more human resources; lower P.T.R.; and more time.

## Changes Recommended*

The changes support staff would like to see made in the procedures reflect a desire for a more uniform, widespread and effective use of them with follow-up to ensure that program modification recommendations are implemented. "Need more uniform approach"; "Need to establish clearer criteria and indicators of children who may be high risk"; "Schools may need to adopt a more comprehensive and effective approach"; "Need to ensure follow through".

There was a strong plea from a Multicultural Consultant for special consideration for E.S.L. students. "I am convinced that Early Identification Procedures are highly beneficial at the JK and SK level, nevertheless, I feel that the needs of children who speak languages other than English should be specified and that an Early Identification program for E.S.L./D. students should be prepared in co-operation with the Multicultural Unit".

There was some desire for a more informal approach with much greater emphasis on program modification. Support was also given to building in greater involvement of other resource staff, particularly special education program leaders, and professional development, particularly on program modification, observation techniques, early childhood development and evaluation of student needs.

## SUMMARY

During the spring of 1982, this study was conducted for the following purposes:

(i) assessing the awareness of school administrators, teaching staff and relevant support personnel about North York Early Identification Procedures

(ii) determining the extent of the implementation of the procedures in North York schools

In order to achieve these purposes, information was gathered from all elementary school principals and support staff and from a random sample of 50% of JK-3 teachers.

---

* Refer to Technical Appendix, Table 10

Of the three groups, principals were the most knowledgeable about the specific Early Identification Procedures. Three-quarters of the principals felt that the procedures have served to heighten the awareness of both teachers and principals of the need to identify and respond early to individual pupil needs. These principals felt that the procedures have provided a more systematic approach to this task. Eighty-one percent of the principals expressed satisfaction with the existing format of the Early Identification Procedures.

Data gathered by means of teacher questionnaires and during classroom visits indicated that teachers were less aware of, less involved with, and less satisfied with the Early Identification Procedures than were principals. The inability of many teachers to respond to questions relating to some of the procedures, however, was not necessarily due to lack of awareness. More often this lack of response was due to the fact that the procedures were not applicable to these teachers' particular grades or were not yet followed in their schools. The majority of teachers who participated in the study had not been formally involved in JK registration, in screening committees to review enrolment questionnaires, in comprehensive reviews or, in many cases, in annual reviews. They were, however, much more familiar with those procedures closely associated with their own classroom responsibilities, e.g. observation, record keeping, program planning. In general, primary teachers were more satisfied with the procedures than were kindergarten teachers (i.e. 60% satisfied as opposed to 38%).

Support staff generally were aware of all the procedures although they were not completely satisfied with the format (i.e. 48% indicated dissatisfaction). While the degree of support staff involvement varied considerably from procedure to procedure, almost all support staff had had the experience of helping some teachers meet the individual needs of students through the development and modification of programs appropriate for the identified students.

Support staff felt that the introduction of Early Identification Procedures has increased the awareness of many teachers and principals in regard to developmental differences and the need for early intervention. Some remarked that teachers are becoming more observant and that referrals are more appropriate than in the past.

Implementation, however, has not been without problems. While over half of the principals (59%) indicated that the task of implementing the Early Identification Procedures is "hard work but possible", constraints of time, staff and resources mean that principals often modify aspects of the procedures at their own discretion to better suit their situation or circumstances. Generally, these changes result in a less formal and less time consuming process. For example, a significant number (26%) of principals downplayed the importance of chairing screening committees to review enrolment questionnaires, cautioning that September is too early to identify needs accurately. Others disputed the need for formal committees, preferring to conduct informal reviews or to concentrate on extreme cases only.

Principals indicated that comprehensive reviews are not necessarily conducted at the end of kindergarten and grade two for all pupils as stated in the policy. In some instances such reviews are held at each grade level for all pupils, in others they are limited to pupils who are considered to be extreme cases. Often comprehensive reviews are incorporated into, and have become indistinguishable from, annual reviews. Twenty percent of the respondents emphasized that "review" is an ongoing process. They felt that this ongoing approach is more pertinent than a once-a-year annual review and is critical for establishing good programing.

The majority of principals reported that their teachers observe students regularly and attempt to develop appropriate programs to respond to observed needs. Although most principals felt that teachers do an adequate job of keeping records of general development, language, and behaviour, many remarked that the form and extent of record keeping vary considerably from teacher to teacher.

Principals perceived the task of program modification as the most difficult part of the Early Identification process. They suggested that first and foremost teachers must develop a better understanding of the process, and must then strengthen specific skills, e.g. assessing learning needs, diagnosing problems, and creating, modifying and implementing appropriate programs to meet individual needs.

While teachers generally reported confidence in their ability to use their informal observations and written records, and in their ability to develop programs which meet the individual needs of their pupils, they also recognized the potential for improving their use of these records and proposed possible means of doing so, e.g. more time during school hours, more professional development and workshops, and provision of relevant information, or checklists.

The support staff who responded reported that implementation has not always been easy. Some felt there has been an increase in frustration among teachers stemming from lack of time, increased paperwork, and confusion and apprehension about what is expected of them. About half felt that both principals and teachers do not apply the concept of individualized programing very well.

Results indicated that principals and teachers request the assistance of support staff quite regularly in regard to Early Identification. Support staff, in turn, believe that they have been able to deliver the appropriate services quite well. Their role commonly involves consulting with teachers, following up programs for identified children, attending Early Identification meetings and yearly reviews, classroom observation and reporting and conducting assessments.

All three groups were in agreement in their perception that the implementation of the Early Identification Procedures could be facilitated by more time, smaller primary classes, more in-class volunteers and teacher aides, and particularly, more professional development and workshops.

## NORTH YORK EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

1. Staff will co-operate with the Department of Public Health and other North York agencies in the development of appropriate preschool identification and intervention programs, as well as the sharing of information.

2. The principal, nurse and junior kindergarten teacher(s) will register all new junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September.

3. After registration, but not later than September, the principal will chair a screening committee to review each enrolment questionnaire in order to identify children requiring immediate intervention and program modifications.

   This committee will consist of the nurse, junior kindergarten teacher, and appropriate resource personnel.

4. Junior kindergarten and kindergarten teachers will observe daily student health, behaviour and development, and then develop appropriate programs to answer the observed needs.

5. Principals will ensure an annual review of all students, involving outside resource personnel when desirable.

6. Principals will co-ordinate a comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade two. This review will include:

   a) health records
   b) teachers' records of observation of general development, language and behaviour, e.g. samples of work, social skills and friendships, strengths and interests, ability to attend to a task
   c) summary of parent interviews and reports; and
   d) development of a student information file

7. Teachers will modify programs to answer the needs identified at these reviews.

8. The emphasis of Early Identification Procedures will be on the informal assessment and observational skills of the teachers, rather than on an extensive formal assessment program, except when program modifications outside the regular classroom appear to be necessary.

9. Regular opportunities for parents and teachers to share information about a child's background and development will be basic components at all stages of these procedures.

10. Programs will be consistent with the development of each child as outlined in the North York Curriculum Document "Programming In The Primary and Junior Divisions".

BOARD OF EDUCATION

REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

# TECHNICAL APPENDIX

## DETERMINATION OF POLICY AWARENESS

## AND USE OF EARLY IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Crawford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

September, 1982

TM 830 008 (2 of 2)

## INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 1982, elementary school principals, kindergarten and primary teachers and support staff completed questionnaires which provided information regarding their knowledge and perceptions of North York's Early Identification Procedures. The highlights of their responses have been summarized in a separate report which may be obtained from Educational Research & Evaluation Services. This report provides detailed information about the responses of each group to each item in their respective questionnaires. The sections of this report are colour coded as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Principals | - | green |
| Teachers | - | yellow |
| Support Staff | - | pink |

Within each section, the numbering of the tables corresponds to the item number in the questionnaires.

## PRINCIPALS

Completed questionnaires/interviews were available for 91 principals.

TABLE 1

"The principal, nurse and junior kindergarten teacher(s) will register all new junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September".[1] How helpful have you found this procedure to be in the identification of learning needs?

| Extremely Helpful | Very Helpful | Helpful | Somewhat Helpful | Not At All Helpful | Not Implemented In My School As Yet | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 32 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 20% | 35% | 30% | 8% | 1% | 5% | 1% |

| Comments | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Additional support people are involved in procedures, e.g. translators, dental, speech, special ed., parent volunteers, program leaders, psycho ed. Principal often absent, although is available as needed before and after to talk. Teachers not always there; need personnel to release teacher from class, e.g. supply teachers, principal | 27 | 30% |
| Procedure is important for providing a context for dialogue between parents, school, and support staff about child's physical, emotional, and social development, and any significant factors; this provides valuable data as well as encourages sharing of information and responsibility | 20 | 22% |
| This initial contact is helpful in identifying children needing immediate program modification, e.g. speech, medical | 15 | 16% |
| Provides early contact for home and school in a comfortable situation; public relations aspect of job important | 14 | 15% |
| Procedure doesn't always provide "true" picture of child; identification of learning needs and implementation of program modification can only follow after being with the child in the classroom for a few months, i.e. late October or early November rather than earlier | 13 | 14% |
| Information nurse provides from home visits and her time and support is extremely helpful, although the amount and depth of information given depends on the individual nurse involved | 12 | 13% |

1 In questions 1-5 the statements come directly from the recommended procedures for implementing early identification in North York: "Developing Approproate Programs for Primary Children Through the Early Identification of Learning Needs".

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Many don't come to formal registration, but straggle in at different times which is a problem | 5 | 5% |
| Degree of staff movement decreases the value of the procedure; JK teacher that the family meets in the spring may not be there in the fall | 5 | 5% |
| Not happy with this formalized, brief, rushed system. Procedure provides contact between home and school which is positive, but it is not useful for identifying learning needs which can only happen in the classroom | 3 | 3% |
| No response | 15 | 16% |
| Other Comments | 28 | 31% |

- Public relations aspect of this procedure is good
- We have been doing this for years
- Principal plays an active role, even if it is not always direct
- Involving JK teacher is the key
- Registration form developed by Earl Haig Family of Schools provides an excellent format for gathering information
- Language limitations are noted at this time
- Program leaders should be involved
- Resources are not always available to follow up with appropriate intervention for all children identified
- Would prefer a more informal registration (perhaps home visits); the present system is too rushed

TABLE 2

"After registration, but not later than September, the principal will chair a screening committee to review each enrolment questionnaire in order to identify children requiring immediate intervention and program modifications." How helpful have you found this procedure to be in the identification of learning needs?

| Extremely Helpful | Very Helpful | Helpful | Somewhat Helpful | Not At All Helpful | Not Implemented In My School As Yet | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 21 | 28 | 9 | 2 | 22 | 5 |
| 4% | 23% | 31% | 10% | 2% | 24% | 5% |

| Comments | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Too early in the year for such a procedure to be of value; teacher requires time in learning environment to recommend meaningful identification of learning needs to plan for intervention and, therefore, do not use the procedure. Need to be cautious about over reacting; needs related to normal development may be identified in a negative way when students are "labelled" | 24 | 26% |
| This procedure is not officially implemented, teachers and principal deal informally in an ongoing way about problems; there is no need for a formal committee | 14 | 15% |
| Procedure useful for extreme problems which can be attended to early in the year with the help of resource personnel and for including the many pupils who missed the registration procedure | 9 | 10% |
| Useful procedure to draw information to principal's attention and for clarification of initial findings | 6 | 7% |
| A broad base of information provides a variety of suggestions and observations which are used to make program modifications. Teachers, nurses, psychoed. consultants, special ed. and program leaders' input very important as are consideration of social and adjustment factors as well as educational issues | 5 | 5% |
| Helpful for identification of learning needs, however, resources are not always available to provide appropriate intervention for all identified children | 5 | 5% |
| Disagree with the procedure as (1) it does not make sense to do it for every student and (2) the focus should be on helping students adjust to formalized learning and to socialize with others rather than on individualized learning at this early stage | 4 | 4% |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Use of formal records - alert cards for all students help flag both gifted and problem children | 3 | 3% |
| No response | 24 | 26% |
| Other Comments | 28 | 31% |

- We were doing this before the procedures to some degree
- Needs time to implement; we'll do more next year
- Don't use enrolment questionnaire; meetings are conducted later in the year to review exceptional needs
- Not necessary in a small school
- Principal has notes on every child filed in his office
- Helps set up reasonable expectations by the teacher for each child which helps children get a good "start" at school
- Unrealistic expectation to be able to do individual program modification for all students, especially with present size of classes
- Problems of lack of time and in-school resources, e.g. supply teachers to free teachers for these meetings

TABLE 3

"Principals will co-ordinate a comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade two." How helpful have you found this procedure to be in determining student learning needs?

| Extremely Helpful | Very Helpful | Helpful | Somewhat Helpful | Not At All Helpful | Not Implemented In My School As Yet | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 35 | 28 | 2 | 1 | 14 | 1 |
| 11% | 38% | 31% | 2% | 1% | 15% | 1% |

| Comments | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Done routinely at all levels as implicit part of promotion procedures and repeated during screening each fall. It is really covered in annual review. Not always for all students | 20 | 22% |
| This procedure is part of a continuing process all year; children are programmed as they are identified during the year and appropriate modifications are made as needed. Records are kept | 18 | 20% |
| Provides update of most accurate information which is used for planning for children's needs for following year by arranging best placement and securing the necessary resources | 11 | 12% |
| The procedure provides opportunities for early evaluation and has reduced the numbers of students who have moved on to the junior division without getting appropriate help | 8 | 9% |
| The procedure is helpful in identifying needs, but delivery of service is not always immediate (e.g. there are waiting lists for psychological assessments) or appropriate | 5 | 5% |
| Because we are a small school the procedure works; although all students are reviewd, we concentrate on program modification for students with difficulties | 3 | 3% |
| Has not implemented it yet; plans to this year and anticipates finding it helpful | 3 | 3% |
| No response | 23 | 25% |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Other Comments | 31 | 34% |

- Use own modified ongoing system, mainly for problems - "team meetings", case conferences
- Each teacher completes a class list which includes social, health or academic problems which goes on with the student the next year. Each grade level is colour coded so the teacher is aware at which level the child is working at in each area
- The Target Population Survey for Bill 82 and a selection of students for reading programs cover this procedure
- I meet with teachers individually and discuss the students; we are planning a day to place students and match children's needs with strengths of the teacher
- Helps primcipal know what he must do to help teachers adjust the problem
- The process is somewhat redundant
- The review is not as comprehensive at grade 2 as at the kindergarten level; it is important to do it at this level
- Has created a heavy workload in terms of identification meetings and referrals, but when we are successful the payoff is worthwhile in terms of improved pupil self concept and teacher morale
- Hard to find time to do this procedure; unrealistic expectations (1) placed on staff at year end and (2) to do this for all students
- Procedure is weakened by problem of staff movement and turnover

## TABLE 4

"Principals will ensure an annual review of all students, involving outside resource personnel when desirable." How helpful have you found this procedure to be for your staff in determining student learning needs?

| Extremely Helpful | Very Helpful | Helpful | Somewhat Helpful | Not At All Helpful | Not Implemented In My School As Yet | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 40 | 24 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 16% | 44% | 27% | 4% | | 4% | 4% |

| Comments | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| This procedure ensures evaluation for all students and is critical for a good program; it helps assess progress, plan, review program modification, keep records up to date (cards), and provides place for sharing of ideas | 24 | 26% |
| Resource personnel are involved as needed, e.g. reading, speech, generalist, special education, psycho ed. consultants, program leaders, nurse, E.S.L., child care worker, Thistletown, Dellcrest | 22 | 24% |
| This is an ongoing process in our school which is more pertinent than an annual review | 18 | 20% |
| The procedure is done as part of promotion process before regrouping for new classes (should be done early in the fall term) | 8 | 9% |
| Done only for those with high need (problems, gifted) as identified | 8 | 9% |
| Procedure is helpful but there are the problems of (1) time and (2) lack of resources, particularly at the junior level. Unrealistic to expect this to be done for every child | 8 | 9% |
| No response | 28 | 29% |
| Other Comments | 29 | 32% |

- Eliminates unnecessary testing
- Helps me know how I can help the teachers
- The procedure is good as the more information you get from more people the better you can understand the children's needs
- Report cards are reviewed three times a year
- This has always been done

- We involve the parents by asking them to describe their children's needs
- Is the Target Population Survey sufficient for this?
- Because we are a small school the principal knows most of the children personally
- In a large school it is unrealistic to review every child in this way
- This procedure is redundant in many cases because of the ongoing contact with support teams, ongoing reviews, etc.
- Need to avoid labelling students at these meetings

5. In your perception, how often are the primary teachers on your staff able to implement the following Early Identification Procedures?

| | All The Time | Usually | Occa-sionally | Never | Do Not Know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Teachers will "modify programs to answer the needs identified at review (meetings)" | 21<br>23% | 62<br>68% | 8<br>9% | 0 | 0 |
| b) Teachers will "observe daily student health, behaviour and development" | 50<br>55% | 40<br>44% | 1<br>1% | 0 | 0 |
| c) Teachers will "keep records of general development, language and behaviour" | 22<br>24% | 46<br>51% | 17<br>19% | 1<br>1% | 5<br>5% |
| d) Teachers will "develop appropriate programs to answer the observed needs" of their students | 20<br>22% | 60<br>66% | 11<br>12% | 0 | 0 |
| e) Teachers will "meet the individual needs of their students in program planning and modification" | 12<br>13% | 69<br>76% | 10<br>11% | 0 | 0 |

Comments

a) - Program modification is done informally all year, not at review meetings

b) - In a large school like ours with large classes (over 30) we just plain try to service!

- At JK and K we use parents to take groups of students to allow teachers to sit at the back of class and observe. We need extra resources in order to do more of this

c) - Each teacher records in her/his own way and the extent of record keeping varies with the teacher and the child

- Some refuse to keep records and keep the information in their heads

- Concerned about written records which can be viewed years later

- It is an unrealistic expectation to keep formal records for ALL students in addition to the numerous tasks teachers have; it is done for students requiring outside help

- Teachers have trouble keeping records; they lack time management skills

- Against extensive record keeping because it can lend to labelling of negative behaviour

- Some resist recording information. Change is slow; we need to relate to teacher's needs and expectations

d) - It is difficult to meet all children's needs as we don't have all the necessary competencies on staff

e) - Tend to focus on problems

- Teachers need a lot of outside support and teacher/principal dialogue; aim is to find a systematic approach

6. Principals may use a variety of approaches to gain information above the ways in which their teachers are implementing Early Identification. How helpful have you found the following?

| | Extremely Helpful | Very Helpful | Helpful | Somewhat Helpful | Not At All Helpful | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) Observing teachers with their classes | 26<br>29% | 36<br>39% | 21<br>23% | 6<br>7% | 0 | 2<br>2% |
| b) Talking informally to teachers | 40<br>44% | 42<br>46% | 7<br>8% | 1<br>1% | 0 | 1<br>1% |
| c) Interacting with teachers during annual review meetings | 33<br>36% | 37<br>41% | 17<br>19% | 2<br>2% | 1<br>1% | 1<br>1% |
| d) Interacting with staff during JK registration procedures | 9<br>10% | 19<br>21% | 24<br>26% | 24<br>26% | 7<br>8% | 7<br>8% |
| e) Interacting with staff during screening committee meetings about JK children | 15<br>16% | 25<br>27% | 23<br>25% | 6<br>7% | 3<br>3% | 19<br>21% |

Other approaches

- Informal ongoing and evolving interaction between principal and teachers is a high priority
- Teacher brings information and observations to the principal's attention for follow-up by appropriate support staff (when available)
- Gain a lot of information by talking to parents
- Information gained from - reading reports
  - talking to the children themselves
- Input is encouraged from others who interact with the children, e.g. lunch and yard duty supervisors, caretaker, secretary, resource people who come into the classroom
- Spot teaching and spot helping with teachers in the classroom helps principal connect with the children as well as providing another reference when he is talking about students with the teachers

TABLE 7

Implementing the Early Identification Procedures requires support from several sources. How often?

| | Always | Usually | Sometimes | Never | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) do you get the information and co-operation you need from the school nurse? | 46<br>51% | 33<br>36% | 12<br>13% | 0 | 0 |
| b) do you perceive that your teachers share with each other information about individual children and their needs? | 41<br>45% | 45<br>49% | 5<br>5% | 0 | 0 |
| c) does Board support staff (e.g. consultants, program leaders) provide help to you and your staff? | 23<br>25% | 44<br>48% | 24<br>26% | 0 | 0 |

Comments

b) - Easier for teachers to dialogue in an open school where team teaching requires this

- There is too much sharing of information between teachers - too much talking where volunteer parents can hear, too much sharing of negative information which leaves a negative label on the child that is hard to change

- Needs to be done formally in appropriate places to protect confidentiality

TABLE 8

(a) How has the school nurse facilitated the implementation of Early Identification Procedures?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Nurse is part of support staff team which meets regularly to discuss identification problems, attends review meetings, provides information on health to screening committee, gathers and shares information on child's background, health, etc., helps interpret information, makes agency contacts, suggests resources available | 50 | 55% |
| Nurse makes home visits, follows up 'home problems', a good liaison between home and school | 49 | 54% |
| Nurse assists with registration, collects information, does testing, health history, deals with medical problems and keeps records, fulfills requests | 47 | 52% |
| Nurse communicates with teachers, parents and principals; she follows up on teachers' concerns, provides information and makes recommendations | 33 | 36% |
| Nurse doesn't have time to share information, to have enough direct contact with families, helpful within time constraints. High turnover and lack of stability in nursing staff is a problem. Some don't openly divulge information. Aren't as available as might be for meetings | 16 | 18% |
| Nurse has contact with classes and observes children in classrooms | 11 | 12% |
| Nurse is important part of team, co-operative, works hard, approachable, available | 11 | 12% |
| No response | 2 | 2% |
| Other Comments | 13 | 14% |

- Nurse is not involved in early identification procedures
- There has been a cutback in the amount of time the nurse is in the school. This is a serious barrier to communication and incongruent with the needs of the procedures
- Have no school nurse
- Need more personnel of this type - needs to be a more useful connection between school workers, social workers, child care workers, family life educators. We need more link with personnel outside the school
- Weekly visits to school
- Once a year she discusses each child with the principal and teacher
- Talks individually to children
- Often with nurse's help we get a non-English speaking parent into the school

(b) How have Board support staff facilitated the implementation of Early Identification Procedures?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Support staff work with classroom teachers, observe students, work informally in class with individual students, test students, help teachers with programming, assessment, and placement of students, suggest or provide appropriate materials and follow-up, work with parents | 51 | 56% |
| Support staff has always been available when their assistance is requested; they are good, highly involved and give good help | 25 | 27% |
| Support staff attend weekly staff meetings, on many committees in program modification, attend review and screening committee meetings, team meetings, present at registration | 23 | 25% |
| Support staff lack time, are not available when we need them and we have to wait (psychoed. consultants are too busy testing), helpful within time constraints, only help when asked; most available time is in meetings and assessment and not enough time for program modification and strategies | 13 | 14% |
| Support staff provide workshops, e.g. observation skills, and P.D. as requested, provide regular sessions on developmental stages of young children | 9 | 10% |
| Board support staff co-operate and work with other resource people and outside agencies (e.g. Dellcrest, speech correction) | 7 | 8% |
| Haven't used support staff, use them very little, unaware of requirement to use them; their help doesn't focus on early identification | 7 | 8% |
| Psychoed. consultants - "key" person for early identification | 5 | 5% |
| No response | 3 | 3% |
| Other Comments | 20 | 22% |

- They spend too much time in meetings rather than helping teachers and children in class
- Implementation of early identification brought no dramatic changes, therefore, little help is needed
- The more support staff work with teachers, the more skilled and confident the teacher becomes in handling all children

and their needs; they have helped get away from isolated classes and withdrawal programs
- We need more consultant help and support in the area of behaviour which has been left up to the principal
- Subject specialists aren't oriented toward individualized program modification
- Most help comes from multi-cultural department in interpreting for parents
- Not enough time for proper implementation of procedures
- Early Childhood Ed. program staff urgently required as part of support service
- Deal mainly with teachers; have no time for working with individual children

TABLE 9

(a) What skills and strengths do you observe your teachers need in order to do a better job at implementing the procedures?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Teachers are sensitive and aware of children's needs, are perceptive, are alert for problems, have good diagnostic skills, are flexible in dealing with children, accept children where they are, good rapport with them, listen to them and are involved with them, concern, respect and interest in the children, insightful, empathy, caring | 43 | 47% |
| Good observation skills - they know what to look for and are perceptive of needs of the total child | 43 | 47% |
| Modify expectations and programs to meet needs of individual children regularly in a variety of ways, capitalizing on students' strengths creatively, and with good follow up | 39 | 43% |
| Keep good records and have good reporting skills | 24 | 26% |
| Have appreciation and knowledge of child's development; skill in avoiding pitfall of overstructuring programs and waiting for developmental "catch-ups". Focus on children's strengths and built on these | 21 | 23% |
| Communicate with parents about needs, problems and programing of children, this provides them with good knowledge of students' backgrounds, home situations, and academic and social development | 20 | 22% |
| Share information about children with other staff members and discuss program ideas and strategies | 16 | 18% |
| Staff is very experienced and knowledgeable; they are conscientious and exhibit a wide range of skills | 14 | 15% |
| Co-operate and collaborate with internal and external resource staff and willing to try new ideas and materials suggested | 12 | 13% |
| Knowledge and good use of materials | 7 | 8% |
| Planning and organizational skills | 4 | 4% |
| No response | 5 | 5% |
| Other Comments | 16 | 18% |

- Staff discussions about the procedures indicate awareness and sincere desire to implement procedures

- It is not the procedures that present the problem - it is the resources
- Act as advocates of student needs with front office
- Make effective use of paraprofessionals
- Spend time over and above call of duty
- Good interpersonal skills

(b) What additional skills do you think your teachers need in order to do a better job at implementing the procedures?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Teachers need further training in developing such classroom skills as observation and diagnostic skills, skills in dealing with behaviour (both "normal" and deviant), program modification skills, developing more creative programs, long range planning to help students and how to deal with a broad range of needs at the same time, program intervention and implementation skills, listening skills and skills to help improve self concept and adjust socially to school | 62 | 68% |
| Teachers need help in such content areas as child development, current educational assessment techniques, philosophy of early identification procedures, family life, life in different cultures, learning disabilities | 29 | 32% |
| Teachers need help in developing such process skills as how to keep meaningful records (learning to record what's valuable in minimal time), time management, organizational skills, understanding of learning processes (how children learn, how teacher's behaviour affects how students learn), how to select appropriate remedial materials and how to utilize resources | 23 | 25% |
| Teachers need more time to observe, keep records, carry out program modification, to consult with parents, to digest materials and skills in class time, to understand students' backgrounds. They need better help, support and co-ordination from available resources (principals, support staff), especially right in the classroom | 19 | 21% |
| Teachers need to gain knowledge about new procedures in teaching, greater understanding that learning is both cognitive and affective, help in going from a more authoritarian to a more democratic way of working, increased tolerance for all students, more awareness of problems of children from poor and single parent homes, ability to recognize that learning new skills involves trial and error and becoming more comfortable with optional ways of doing things, better understanding of process, and periodic exposure to pertinent successful situations related to problems they are experiencing | 12 | 13% |
| Teachers already have good skills for identifying problems and programing accordingly | 5 | 5% |
| No response | 12 | 13% |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Other Comments | 25 | 27% |

- North York needs long range goals in this area
- There is need for a standardized "check off" form of skill and behavioural expectations for JK and grade 2
- Problem of classroom coverage during evaluation and assessment meetings
- Need to refine present skills which will come through continued use and workshop discussions at the school or family level
- Need intensive in-service program to bring everybody up to the level of theoretical understanding that special ed. teachers have; they are helping us meet 90% of the needs of the school
- Need to get to "know" parents personally, visit homes, share progress of child with team that includes parents
- Learn to develop pupil file to follow child
- Need to develop more experience - centered programs in primary grades (smaller classes are necessary to do this)
- Teachers placed at new grade levels (often inappropriate for their background) need new skills
- Need to have positive professional development experiences related to practical aspects of program development, and how to handle large demands and pressures
- Need the opportunity to share ideas and problems related to the program with other teachers

TABLE 10

What impact has the implementation of Early Identification Procedures had on your school?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| The procedures have heightened awareness rather than creating anything new; process is more formal and systematic; greater awareness of need to identify individual's needs and problems early; better use of observation skills; greater awareness of child development; more aware of difficulty of implementing change to respond to needs; aware of special difficulties of children of single parents; more clinical approach has led to better action | 67 | 74% |
| Improved programming, organization, decision making, and planning; more programs and more time to meet individual needs; improved enrichment; increase in achievement and self concept; deals with prevention and intervention | 29 | 32% |
| Staff share responsibility of assessing, evaluating, and dealing with problems with other resource people; better able to help child in class before turning to outside help and to suggest special ed. placement and psychological assessments as only alternatives; more involvement of support staff and greater opportunity to share information and expertise | 19 | 21% |
| Very time consuming, a lot more work; need more time to work with staff; follow up is slow; we know more about problems and needs but do not have time to do individual program modification | 8 | 8% |
| Ongoing interpretation, modification, and evaluation of programs rather that at set time; hold continuing ongoing reviews - especially about "needy" children | 6 | 7% |
| Better communication between home and school which leads to increased parental support of the school | 5 | 5% |
| Better record keeping and documentation of ideas | 5 | 5% |
| Presence of principal felt more fully; principal's impact as important as the procedures themselves in making them a high priority | 3 | 3% |
| No response | 2 | 2% |
| Other Comments | 22 | 24% |

- There is heightened anxiety about needy children and some alienation at the introduction of yet another demand

- Teachers have a greater sense of the resources and materials needed and are encouraged to use these to do a better job
- A lot of frustration because of lack of available French materials and resource personnel - it has created communication problems with parents and teachers who don't master English
- Parent volunteer program expanded
- Orange cards force us to focus on the kids in the classroom rather than looking for outside help and work to make the program meet the different needs
- At least two teachers at this school are well versed in early identification and that helps a lot
- The help of Anne Gibson and some top teachers and the principal have had more impact than the procedures
- Everyone is at different stages with the procedures. Early identification should NOT be negotiable; the procedures need to be implemented. We need resources

## TABLE 11

(a) How do you feel about the existing format of the Early Identification Procedures?

| Very Satisfied | Somewhat Satisfied | Satisfied | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 18 | 37 | 14 | 1 | 3 |
| 20% | 20% | 41% | 15% | 1% | 3% |

Comments

The format in the report is too formal and too structured; each principal does it in his own style. The procedures hold the principal accountable

As laid out in the guidelines, there is a lot of unnecessary paper work

The goals are commendable, but it is unrealistic to expect us to achieve them

We must not "overuse" and make the procedures too formal; we must allow normal development to take its course. Some schools are doing too much before school begins (testing, etc.) which leads to labelling. Students must be seen in the learning context before modifying programs. Emphasis should be on ongoing evaluation and programing

(b) In your perception, how difficult is the task of implementing the Early Identification Procedures?

| Very Easy To Implement | Fairly Easy to Implement | Hard Work But Possible | A Completely Impossible Task | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 30 | 54 | 2 | 1 |
| 4% | 33% | 59% | 2% | 1% |

Comments

Fairly easy to implement if tokenism is the mode of engagement; hard work but possible if effective change is to be achieved

A completely impossible task in a large school; there is not enough time

Are not enough resources in a small school

Need more resources available in order to implement

Depends on availability of non-school support staff so teachers can attend meetings

Very time consuming, especially the formal meetings (which are difficult to arrange)

TABLE 12

(a) To what extent do your present resources allow you to implement the Early Identification Procedures?

| To A Great Extent | To A Moderate Extent | To A Small Extent | Not At All Not At All | N/A N/A |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | 54 | 14 | 1 | 4 |
| 20% | 59% | 15% | 1% | 4% |

(b) What additional resources, if any, do you need?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Need increased support services on a regular basis: special education, speech, reading, early identification people, child care and social workers, psychiatrists, paraprofessionals (aides, volunteers) to work directly with children individually and in small groups (remedial and enrichment) to modify programs. Need supply teachers, etc., to free teachers for meetings. Need more time from psychometricians and psychoed. consultants. Need more kindergarten staff. Need support resource team to meet regularly. Need full time compensatory person | 61 | 67% |
| Need time and means for teachers to be freed from classes for meetings with resource personnel so appropriate planning can ensue, for teachers to meet with psychoed. consultants for educational assessment, and to meet with parents | 24 | 26% |
| Lower P.T.R. so classes are smaller. Cannot implement procedures in-depth and in a meaningful way with present class sizes and time constraints | 21 | 23% |
| Need dental and medical resources and a nurse on a regular basis in the school | 21 | 23% |
| Budget priorities must be changed if improvement is to occur; need more money; budget cuts are not allowing us to implement procedures | 15 | 16% |
| Increased training: P.D. workshops, with specialists in early identification field, more courses about child development, more in-service training | 15 | 16% |
| Need proper equipment and appropriate and up-to-date materials (these are being cut because of lack of funds) | 10 | 11% |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| No response | 0 | |
| Other Comments | 18 | 20% |

- Teachers don't require help for identification of problems, but for modifying programs
- Need a better comprehensive document to help JK teachers in parent interview
- Early identification and Bill 82 are making too great a demand on teachers
- We are an inner city special needs school Level II with NO resources
- We need French speaking support services and support materials in French
- We need faster servicing of difficult cases
- We need full time librarian

TABLE 13

What changes, if any, would you recommend in the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Revisions needed, e.g. | | |
| a) revise enrolment questionnaire so it asks more realistic questions<br>b) - unrealistic to expect TK teacher to be at registration<br>- registration procedure is not too effective as many do not register until later<br>c) revision of orange cards - more space, etc.<br>d) have a standard form for collecting information<br>e) have screening committee later in "fall term" (not September)<br>f) "front ended" procedures, e.g. registration, early meetings should be less formalized; need more optional ways of doing them depending on principal's style, teacher's skills and student's needs; need fewer meetings - problems are frequently developmental<br>g) evaluation should be ongoing process of all children - without specific dates<br>h) drop idea of review of all students for now<br>i) procedures too defined, i.e. labelling - should emphasize strengths and talents not just needs; should be broad flexible guidelines which can be creatively developed to meet needs in each individual school's situation | 28 | 31% |
| Need to build in greater resources as well as better distribution and use of resources for more effective implementation and development of appropriate modification; teachers and resource staff need to work on the process collaboratively. Need supply teachers. Need compensatory person to work with children right in regular classroom | 13 | 14% |
| Need greater clarification of what it means to modify programs appropriately. Are there better ways of helping teachers implement the process? | 7 | 8% |
| Need P.D. workshops on observation, record keeping, program modification - not the mechanics, but the process | 5 | 5% |
| More "in the classroom" support by support staff who can first observe and then offer suggestions and stay long enough to see if strategies are working | 4 | 4% |
| Adequate release time must be built in to allow for necessary meetings and communication to allow procedures to be implemented | 4 | 4% |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Procedures are too idealistic; too much is expected - program modification as well as Bill 82, mainstreaming, etc. | 4 | 4% |
| Need smaller classes in order to implement the procedures | 3 | 3% |
| No response | 22 | 24% |
| Other Comments | 31 | 34% |

- Need to capitalize on benefits of record keeping. Teachers don't perceive benefits it can provide and hence don't like to do it
- Too soon to comment - need more time to assess
- Feel procedures are deficiency based, i.e. negatives rather than strengths are emphasized. Would like to see a greater emphasis on developmental and more positive aspects - working with strengths. The tone is still Special Ed.
- Concern that procedures are not over-emphasized to the point that other programs, e.g. junior programing, suffers
- Need more attention to students coming from home environments lacking love and support
- Against teacher visits to home unless parent requests it
- Home visits by teachers give teachers real insights as child is seen in context of home environment
- Need time to refine and polish what we are already doing
- Program is much better than the procedures, or lack of procedures, employed prior to its implementation
- Since we are all accountable, we should NOT be designing our own system. Should be done centrally with every school responsible for implementation. Would eliminate guessing and be good P.R. for North York
- Need to work more closely with parents; more sharing of information, etc.
- Need to keep elementary schools small in order to carry out procedures so principals can spend more time with students and teachers
- Will the focus on each child dilute the attention on the special child?
- It would be helpful to have a record of programs various teachers have attempted in regard to program modification, i.e. what worked and what did not
- In order for procedures to work, Board administration must take greater care in where they transfer and place teachers
- Need to develop more comprehensive scales with more criteria to help with observation of children
- Early identification should be linked to PPJD

## TEACHERS

Completed questionnaires were returned by 139 teachers, 61 kindergarten teachers and 78 primary teachers.

## TABLE 2

"The principal, nurse and junior kindergarten teacher(s) will register all new junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September."

(a) If you have been involved in the registration of junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September, how helpful have you found this procedure to be in the identification of learning needs?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 8 | 20 | 26 | 15 | - | 31 |
| Primary | 3 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 95 |

(b) If you have not been involved with the procedure, check the appropriate reason below.

| | | Kindergarten # | Primary #* |
|---|---|---|---|
| (i) | does not apply to my grade | 10 | 73 |
| (ii) | I am unaware of the procedure | - | 4 |
| (iii) | I am aware of the procedure, but to my knowledge it is not being followed in my school | 4 | 1 |
| (iv) | I am a JK teacher who is not directly involved in JK registration | 4 | - |
| | No answer | 1 | - |

* The numbers add up to more than the number of teachers who did not respond to part (a) of this question as some teachers checked more than one response.

TABLE 3

"After registration but not later than September, the principal will chair a screening committee to review each enrolment questionnaire in order to identify children requiring immediate intervention and program modifications."

(a) If you have been involved in a screening committee, how helpful have you found it to be?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 2 | 5 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 70 |
| Primary | - | 1 | 5 | - | - | 93 |

(b) If you have <u>not</u> been involved with the procedure check the appropriate reason below.

| | | Kindergarten # | Primary # |
|---|---|---|---|
| (i) | does not apply to my grade | 17 | 62 |
| (ii) | I am unaware of the procedure | 17 | 12 |
| (iii) | I am aware of the procedure, but to my knowledge it is not being followed in my school | 16 | - |
| | No answer | 3 | 1 |

TABLE 4

"Principals will co-ordinate a comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade two."

(a) If you have been involved in this procedure, how helpful have you found it to be in determining student learning needs?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 5 | 13 | 15 | 2 | - | 66 |
| Primary | 3 | 11 | 15 | 3 | - | 68 |

(b) If you have not been involved with this procedure check the appropriate reason below.

| | | Kindergarten # | Primary # |
|---|---|---|---|
| (i) | does not apply to my grade | 10 | 23 |
| (ii) | I am unaware of the procedure | 14 | 20 |
| (iii) | I am aware of the procedure, but to my knowledge it is not being followed in my school | 11 | 9 |
| | No answer | 5 | 3 |

(c) How helpful have you found the information learned at these comprehensive reviews for making modifications in your program?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 3 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 67 |
| Primary | 5 | 10 | 22 | 1 | 1 | 60 |

(d) Describe some of the basic modifications and how you made them.

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Because of a flexible system, modifications were constantly being made according to individual's needs, i.e. reading and math programs, special tasks for cerebral palsied | 20 | 14 |
| Used resource people more: student volunteers and parents for consistency of routines and expectations in home and school. All other forms of "help" are insufficient. These people provided advice and insight into problems | 18 | 12 |
| Lowered expectations according to the student's capability, i.e. lighter workloads (gradually increased), less paperwork, shorter school time | 9 | 6 |
| Implement one-to-one work or work in small groups for constant support improving self concept while providing added attention for those with special needs | 7 | 5 |
| Often behaviour modification was made | 6 | 4 |
| Added choice of activities geared to motor skills, fine and large muscle, using Phys. Ed., art materials and manipulative materials | 5 | 3 |
| Use of higher grade materials - flexibility between higher and lower grade, i.e. academically poor participate in higher grade's non-academic activities | 4 | 3 |
| Closer observation of sight and hearing which were examined if necessary | 3 | 2 |
| Ongoing interviews, discussions and review with nurse, school administration, last year's and this year's teachers were helpful towards this and next year's programing | 3 | 2 |
| Open-ended challenges, encouragement and stimulation for all, especially the gifted | 3 | 2 |
| Other | 7 | 5 |
| No answer | 85 | 61 |

TABLE 5

"Principals will ensure an annual review of all students, involving outside resource personnel when desirable."

(a) If you have been involved in this procedure, how helpful have you found it to be in determining student learning needs?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 5 | 18 | 29 | 8 | - | 39 |
| Primary | 5 | 19 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 37 |

(b) If you have not been involved with the procedure check the appropriate reason below.

| | | Kindergarten # | Primary # |
|---|---|---|---|
| (i) | does not apply to my grade | 3 | 3 |
| (ii) | I am unaware of the procedure | 8 | 17 |
| (iii) | I am aware of the procedure, but to my knowledge it is not being followed in my school | 12 | 11 |
| | No answer | 1 | - |

(c) How helpful have you found the information you received at the annual review meeting for making modifications in your program?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 3 | 11 | 20 | 13 | 3 | 49 |
| Primary | 3 | 18 | 27 | 10 | 5 | 37 |

(d) Describe some modifications you made and how you made them.

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Able to request appropriate support - more individual or small group help and special materials obtained | 16 | 11 |
| Able to exchange ideas with the resource staff re strategies, program implementation. As well, discussions with psychologist, nurse and family aides develop teacher's understanding and rapport with the child | 15 | 10 |
| Informs the principal of the child's needs (Special Ed., E.S.L.) for next year | 7 | 5 |
| Modification of class program - altering assignments, i.e. language skills: allowing for a variety of communication | 6 | 4 |
| No suggestions for program modification were obtained - given little information re psychological assessments | 5 | 3 |
| Modification made for slow learners, i.e. less structured gym class time, less class time, more exploratory time | 3 | 2 |
| Opportunity provided for participation in special programs, i.e. Family of Schools Enrichment or special needs classroom | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 7 | 5 |
| No answer | 84 | 60 |

TABLE 6

(a) In what ways do you observe and note your observations?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Observe behaviour, eagerness, attention span and performance of physical and academic tasks. Also observe social behaviour with friends and adults (principally interaction with the teacher). Also watch the different reactions to different settings, group sizes and materials. | 47 | 34 |
| Files kept on each child with work samples, test results, artwork | 31 | 22 |
| Daily records are kept using checklists or a daybook or journal in which incidents are recorded as they occur or after class | 31 | 22 |
| Anecdotal notes are kept | 29 | 20 |
| Observe personal appearance - hygiene and general health including eyesight and hearing | 20 | 14 |
| Only mental notes are taken unless very serious or unusual observation of a problem is made because there is not enough time | 16 | 11 |
| Date observations to reveal patterns which aids in comparing and determining development | 13 | 9 |
| Keep a progress book with one page per child and written records | 13 | 9 |
| Note observations on the report card and a note which is put in the O.S.R. file | 5 | 3 |
| Absences are checked every morning or twice a day | 5 | 3 |
| Other | 18 | 13 |
| No answer | 4 | 3 |

(b) Generally, what use did you make of your observations?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Observations used as reference in reporting and discussions on students with future teachers, principals, at yearly review meeting - in parent/teacher interviews and as extra information - working with parents | 80 | 58 |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Observations used for program modification for individual - providing appropriate learning environment re expectations rate and extra help | 52 | 37 |
| Used to get outside help from resource people (home and parents) and the nurse re medical and psychological testing | 34 | 24 |
| Used as reference for report cards and note that goes into O.S.R. | 29 | 21 |
| Used to observe patterns of improvement or regression is such things as social behaviour, motor development and academic weaknesses | 26 | 19 |
| Observations used for program modifications for group - making up groups or centres oriented around certain skills and social problems | 21 | 15 |
| For own professional growth re knowledge of children and the particular child to improve teacher/student rapport often through discussion with the child for and about observations | 11 | 8 |
| Other | 5 | 4 |
| No answer | 8 | 6 |

(c) How well do you feel you have been able to utilize your observations in the development of individualized "custom-made" programing?

| | Extremely Well % | Very Well % | Well % | Not Too Well % | Not At All Well % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 10 | 21 | 56 | 8 | 2 | 3 |
| Primary | 5 | 33 | 46 | 10 | - | 5 |

(d) How comfortable do you feel in creating a different program for each child?

| | Extremely Comfortable % | Very Comfortable % | Comfortable % | Mildly Comfortable % | Not At All Comfortable % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 3 | 33 | 33 | 20 | 5 | 5 |
| Primary | 10 | 22 | 40 | 19 | 6 | 3 |

TABLE 7

"Teachers are to keep records "of general development, language and behaviour, e.g. samples of work, social skills and friendships, strengths and interests, ability to attend to a task"."

(a) How helpful have you found this procedure in facilitating the development of programing which reflects the individual needs in your class?

| | Extremely Helpful % | Very Helpful % | Helpful % | Not Too Helpful % | Not At All Helpful % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 8 | 34 | 41 | 11 | - | 5 |
| Primary | 11 | 28 | 49 | 5 | - | 6 |

(b)(i) If you are <u>not</u> keeping a file of your students' work, check the appropriate reason below.

| | Kindergarten # | Primary # |
|---|---|---|
| I am unaware of the record keeping procedure | 2 | 4 |
| I am not sure how to go about keeping records of students' work | 1 | 3 |
| Other reasons | - | 5 |

(ii) How well do you feel you have been able to use these records in making the appropriate program modifications?

| | Extremely Well % | Very Well % | Well % | Not Too Well % | Not At All Well % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 8 | 18 | 47 | 15 | 3 | 8 |
| Primary | 8 | 38 | 36 | 6 | - | 11 |

(b)(i) Please state other reasons for not keeping a file of your students' work.

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| JK and K students proud of work and take it home | 3 | 2 |
| Don't feel it merits the effort | 1 | 1 |
| Ongoing teacher/pupil interaction more meaningful | 1 | 1 |
| Pupils keep own records | 1 | 1 |
| Haven't found system I'm satisfied with | 1 | 1 |

(ii) What would be of help to you in developing your record keeping system?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| More time (a) in class, (b) P.D. day | 23 | 17 |
| A workshop discussing more efficient systems and studying samples - with other teachers | 20 | 14 |
| An aide to attend to child's needs while observing and recording | 12 | 9 |
| Standard materials and guidelines, i.e. pre-printed forms, checklists, files, folders, standard filing system | 12 | 9 |
| More storage space | 6 | 4 |
| Smaller class size | 4 | 2 |
| Other | 5 | 4 |
| No answer | 62 | 45 |

(c)(i) Describe how you collect and how you keep records.

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| File or folder on each child is kept with exceptional and randomly picked work samples along with teacher's notes on behaviour, test results and attendance record. Both child and teacher put work into these folders | 90 | 65 |
| Keep teacher workbooks with checklists for specific skills and tasks completed and daily observation charts and anecdotal notes from teacher's journal | 42 | 30 |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Children keep own work folders which are examined by parent and teacher to determine progress | 17 | 12 |
| Children keep own journals which are examined by the parent and the teacher | 3 | 2 |
| Other | 17 | 12 |
| No answer | 15 | 11 |

(iii) Give one example of how you used these records to plan, develop and modify your program to meet individual needs

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| The individual is able to get a special program, i.e. reading program, in the areas where he/she is better or worse than the class | 20 | 14 |
| Records are helpful for deciding on groups according to academic and social problems, weaknesses and particular interests | 11 | 8 |
| Records reveal child's behavioural patterns or work habits. Any negative ones are gotten rid of through program modification | 9 | 6 |
| Pieces of work and tests reveal patterns (weaknesses and strengths) which enable the teacher to structure individual programs | 9 | 6 |
| Perceptual handicaps are revealed and appropriate outside help is called in | 7 | 5 |
| Teacher aide is brought in to help on specific problem areas | 7 | 5 |
| Materials are introduced which are developed or purchased by the teacher especially to meet the individual's needs, i.e. textbooks, manipulative materials | 5 | 4 |
| Records reveal the child's main interests which can be incorporated into his/her program to make it more appealing and, therefore, successful | 4 | 3 |
| Minor problems are quickly detected, i.e. child inverting 7's, and quickly solved with some one-to-one attention before they become major | 4 | 3 |
| Records based on child's journal and observation show a low self concept. More individual attention is paid to boost child's esteem and instill confidence in areas of weakness | 4 | 3 |

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Other | 18 | 13 |
| No answer | 40 | 29 |

(iv) What would help you use these records more effectively in planning and modifying your program?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| More out of class time for recording, programing, discussing problems with other teachers and resource staff | 33 | 24 |
| Information provided on a better system for faster more efficient observing and recording, i.e. a class workshop like Anne Gibson's "How to Observe", pre-printed forms with checklists of observable traits | 20 | 14 |
| An aide in the class to allow the time and opportunity to observe and record daily planning time, "Teacher aides are needed if Early I.D. is to be a reality" | 11 | 8 |
| Smaller class size | 8 | 6 |
| More materials - money to supplement classroom equipment, games and learning aides | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 6 | 4 |
| No answer | 63 | 45 |

TABLE 8

Implementing the Early Identification Procedures requires support from several sources.

| | | | Always % | Usually % | Some-times % | Never % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (a) | Are you getting the information and co-operation you need from the school nurse? | K | 29 | 36 | 29 | 0 | 5 |
| | | P | 37 | 28 | 19 | 10 | 5 |
| (b) | Are you getting the support you need (e.g. appropriate meetings) from your principal? | K | 31 | 38 | 25 | 0 | 6 |
| | | P | 40 | 32 | 18 | 5 | 5 |
| (c) | Do you receive help from teachers in your school when you need it? | K | 34 | 47 | 11 | 2 | 5 |
| | | P | 38 | 40 | 17 | 1 | 5 |
| (d) | Are you getting appropriate help from support staff when you need it? | K | 23 | 44 | 23 | 0 | 10 |
| | | P | 28 | 42 | 26 | 0 | 4 |

| Comments | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| There was not enough support staff to handle all the problems, therefore, only the most serious were dealt with. (Maybe get parents to help.) "An effective program in Early I.D. requires a person in "full-time" capacity in the school" | 13 | 9 |
| Too much red tape and paperwork makes identification, testing, reviewing and developing a program take too long, i.e. "early winter concern not checked out by May" | 5 | 4 |
| Early I.D. is not really a priority as support staff is taken up with older children while adopting a "wait and see" attitude with JK and SK, i.e. psychologist does not test SK's | 5 | 4 |
| Other | 21 | 15 |
| No comment | 95 | 68 |

TABLE 9

(a) In your perception, how difficult is the task of implementing the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Very Easy To Implement % | Fairly Easy To Implement % | Hard Work But Possible % | A Completely Impossible Task % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 7 | 38 | 44 | 1 | 10 |
| Primary | 3 | 19 | 59 | 1 | 18 |

(b) In which of the areas listed below would further training enable you to implement the Early Identification Procedures more effectively?

| | Kindergarten % | Primary % |
|---|---|---|
| . program planning (including program development and modification) skills | 47 | 54 |
| . time management | 41 | 53 |
| . record keeping skills | 41 | 37 |
| . observation skills | 29 | 42 |
| . utilization of support staff | 34 | 27 |
| . other | 7 | 9 |
| No answer | 11 | 4 |

Other suggestions:

- More time for planning, observing and getting necessary personnel together
- Ongoing development in these areas is always needed
- Have a meeting to completely outline and familiarize our staff with the procedures
- Psychological testing and special placement takes time because of workload
- Child psychology courses
- Negotiation skills so that greater concern with the needs of primary pupils could be featured in budget and personnel
- Need training in coping and developing programs for handicapped children
- Need a resource list to contact for advice, not just testing but help in setting up modifications
- "How can this be done without hours at school, writing?"
- More budgetary resources needed

(c) Check the item(s) which indicate your preferred source of help.

| | Kindergarten % | Primary % |
|---|---|---|
| . in-service training | 57 | 53 |
| . discussions with other teachers at your grade level | 51 | 40 |
| . formal staff development in your own school or family of schools | 34 | 35 |
| . personal contact with support staff | 29 | 40 |
| . other | 3 | 3 |
| No answer | 3 | 4 |

Other suggestions:

- More teacher aides with suggestions and help for program modification
- More planning time
- Less students
- Resident teacher whose sole job is identifying program and giving help when needed
- More on physical development
- Workshops should be on P.D. days, 4-8 classes too exhausting
- "Where is advanced training available?"
- Support staff that can be used by SK
- "How about a Board sponsored reading course?"

(d)(i) Have you attended workshops as part of professional development on Early Identification Procedures in the past?

| | Yes % | No % | Not Applicable % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 44 | 47 | 2 | 7 |
| Primary (Grades 1 & 2 only) | 29 | 54 | 2 | 15 |

(ii) If you attended the workshops, describe what you found helpful.

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| These workshops were a good general introduction elaborating on observation and record keeping and teaching methods. Teacher discussions were helpful in exchanging ideas on these topics | 27 | 20 |
| Too much time was wasted on the general, i.e. on vague philosophy or formalities of testing vs more practical topics | 3 | 2 |
| Nothing that was learned was put into practice by the teacher or school - no follow-ups on the topic | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 7 | 5 |
| No answer | 99 | 72 |

What specific skills have you learned?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Improved observation and recording skills thanks to behavioural checklists, reviews on expected growth at certain ages, information on filing - overall a reinforcement of skills and of the program | 20 | 14 |
| None | 4 | 3 |
| Other | 4 | 3 |
| No answer | 111 | 80 |

What else would you have liked to see included?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Overall, a more indepth, focussed approach is needed with more examples of efficient, easily-managed systems of recording, i.e. a sample file and program modification, i.e. a situation for which a program is developed. Also, more practical classroom tools and materials | 17 | 13 |
| More information on interpreting observations, learning to distinguish a disability from immaturity and proper program modification for these problems | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 6 | 4 |
| No answer | 110 | 80 |

TABLE 10

(a) How do you feel about the existing format of the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Very Satisfied % | Somewhat Satisfied % | Satisfied % | Dissatisfied % | Very Dissatisfied % | Not Implemented In My School As Yet % | No Response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 2 | 11 | 25 | 29 | 3 | 11 | 18 |
| Primary | 4 | 14 | 42 | 19 | - | 10 | 10 |

(b) What changes, if any, would you recommend in the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| The procedures could have been more specific, providing specific guidelines to the whole process as well as some standardization of what skills and development are to be recorded. It should have been more practical, i.e. less psychological jargon and more on the connection between diagnosis and programing | 13 | 9 |
| More support staff would make a lighter workload for teacher and more efficient results | 8 | 6 |
| Nothing seems to get done beyond identification (if that) in the younger years - especially JK and SK where the support staff (psychologist and E.S.L.) don't help out. Some form of special help is needed if only informal | 7 | 5 |
| Time problems - it takes too long to screen and test the child. Often it is too late in the year to do anything. The methods used are too formal and time-consuming for practical purposes | 5 | 4 |
| More supervision from the administration is needed to check that present procedures have been implemented - this means more compulsory workshops and perhaps a full-time representative working to develop the system in each school | 4 | 3 |
| More emphasis is needed on physical tasks, developmental norms | 2 | 1 |
| Other | 19 | 14 |
| No answer | 79 | 58 |

## SUPPORT STAFF

Completed questionnaires were returned by 48 support staff, 22 program leaders/generalists and 26 psychoeducational consultants.

TABLE 2

Please indicate the extent of your involvement with each of the Early Identification Procedures listed below.

| Procedure | I am involved in all my schools | | | I am involved in some of my schools | | | I am not involved in any of my schools | | | I an unaware of the procedure | | | No response | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % |
| a) The principal, nurse and junior kindergarten teacher(s) will register all new junior kindergarten children during the spring term for entry to school in September | 5 | - | 2 | 27 | 8 | 17 | 64 | 92 | 79 | - | - | - | 5 | - | 2 |
| b) After registration but not later than September, the principal will chair a screening committee to review each enrolment questionnaire in order to identify children requiring immediate intervention and program modification | - | - | - | 23 | 31 | 27 | 68 | 50 | 58 | 0 | 23 | 17 | - | - | - |
| c) Principals will co-ordinate a comprehensive review of all students at the end of kindergarten and grade two | - | - | - | 45 | 35 | 40 | 50 | 54 | 52 | 5 | 12 | 8 | - | - | - |
| d) Principals will ensure an annual review of all students involving outside resource personnel when desirable | - | 15 | 8 | 73 | 31 | 46 | 27 | 31 | 29 | 5 | 19 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| e) Helping teachers to observe daily student health, behaviour and development | 18 | 42 | 31 | 68 | 42 | 54 | 14 | 12 | 13 | - | 4 | 2 | - | - | - |
| f) Helping teachers to structure and "modify programs to answer the needs identified at review meetings" | 18 | 46 | 33 | 72 | 50 | 60 | 9 | 4 | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| g) Helping teachers to "develop appropriate programs to answer observed needs" | 22 | 38 | 31 | 68 | 58 | 63 | 9 | 4 | 6 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| h) Helping teachers to meet the individual needs of their students in program planning and modification | 18 | 46 | 33 | 77 | 54 | 65 | 5 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Note: Total percentages may equal more than 100 as several respondents gave more than one answer.

TABLE 3

(a) How frequently do the following staff request your help with Early Identification Procedures?

| | Frequently | | | Sometimes | | | Rarely | | | Not at all | | | No response/ Not applicable | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % |
| Principals | 14 | 35 | 25 | 59 | 42 | 50 | 18 | 15 | 17 | 9 | 4 | 6 | - | 4 | 2 |
| Nurses | 5 | 8 | 6 | 14 | 15 | 5 | 9 | 38 | 25 | 59 | 31 | 44 | 14 | 8 | 10 |
| Teachers | 23 | 35 | 29 | 59 | 46 | 52 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 4 | - | - | - |
| Support Staff | 18 | 15 | 17 | 36 | 42 | 40 | 32 | 23 | 27 | 5 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 |
| Other | - | 8 | 4 | 9 | 12 | 8 | - | - | - | 5 | 4 | 4 | 81 | 77 | 84 |

(b) In general, how well do you feel you have been able to fill these requests?

| | Extremely well/Very well % | Well % | Not too well/Not at all well % | No response % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Leaders | 32 | 55 | 5 | 14 |
| Psychoeducational Consultants | 31 | 54 | 12 | 4 |
| Total | 31 | 54 | 8 | 8 |

Note: Percentages may total more than 100 as several respondents gave more than one answer.

(c) In what ways have you typically helped teachers and principals with the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hold regular meetings re student n... make program suggestions/discuss learning problems in developmental terms/suggest appropriate resources and direction/consult with teachers and principals re children with special needs/follow-up with identified children | 11 | 11 | 22 (46%) |
| Attend Early Identification meetings/involved in yearly review of all children with teachers and principals/help fill out PM cards | 4 | 14 | 18 (38%) |
| Observe children/during registration/in classroom/write observation report | 6 | 11 | 17 (35%) |
| Conduct educational assessments, informal diagnostic testing/interpret developmental data/provide diagnosis/involved in screening gifted/set up play reading program to assess learning behaviour and its effect on performance to differentiate between children who may have learning disability and those who are immature | 2 | 7 | 9 (19%) |
| Meet with parents/advise parents of program modification/assist with parent interviews/ help with development of strategies, counselling approaches to parents | 2 | 6 | 8 (16%) |
| Help raise awareness level re current policy and procedures/have knowledge of procedures/ aware of research related to procedures/helped draft questionnaire for use at JK registration/ met with JK-Gr.1 teachers re procedures being used | 2 | 3 | 5 (10%) |
| Hold P.D. workshops, e.g. on observation, tracking, recording | 3 | 2 | 5 (10%) |
| Work with teacher in class/follow-up in classroom and between support help | 3 | 1 | 4 (8%) |
| Assist in management of inappropriate behaviour/ use behaviour modification and management | 1 | 3 | 4 (8%) |
| Make referrals to outside agencies | 2 | 2 | 4 (8%) |

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Provide resource materials | 2 | 1 | 3 (6%) |
| Provide information about family and educational background for immigrant families/assess first language development of JK and SK children | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |
| Other:<br>- Suggest specific record keeping strategies<br>- Made suggestions to principal re modifying review procedures<br>- Help them to focus or clarify questions<br>- My Family of Schools does Early I.D. in a very haphazard way<br>- Participate in reviews on request | | | 6 (13%) |
| No response | | | 4 (8%) |

TABLE 4

What impact has the implementation of Early Identification Procedures had on your role?

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| No change/not a great deal/minimal | 5 | 13 | 18 (38%) |
| Helped to facilitate early intervention in the regular classroom/has led to earlier involvement with our service/more and earlier assessments will help me to assist children whose first language is not English before they have difficulties in grade 1 or 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 (17%) |
| There are many more meetings, e.g. with support staff, teachers and principals/more pre-referral conferences before students considered for assessment | 1 | 6 | 7 (15%) |
| Has increased the number of referrals/increased the expectation for special education support, i.e. if we have identified a student as being different in some way, there must be some exceptionality present as per Bill 82/doubled the workload | - | 6 | 6 (13%) |
| Helped me become more knowledgeable about kids, their needs and characteristics and implications for programing/has given us a good basis for discussion about individual children and their needs as well as the needs of groups of children/enables me to be of more use to principals and staff | 3 | 2 | 5 (10%) |
| Generally positive/support staff now know what is expected and can follow the appropriate steps/have better understanding of what might be observed, particularly in children's involvement with music/support staff have now become a team in dealing with identified children | 3 | - | 3 (6%) |
| Now asked to suggest and implement program modification for individual students/work with individual students rather than suggest teaching strategies for whole class | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Helped me tie curriculum to Early I.D./if more than one-third of class is considered high risk am asked to modify teaching method | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |
| Has generated more paper work | 1 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| Other: | | | |
| - Fairly major/has shifted assessment load to grades 3-6/have more program time in early years | | | |
| - Hold workshops on a family basis | | | |
| - Has taken time to write support materials for Early I.D. | | | 6 (13%) |
| - There is more parent involvement | | | |
| - Was more involved a few years ago | | | |
| - Am not certain to what degree Early I.D. Procedures have been implemented | | | |
| No response | | | 3 |

TABLE 5

(a) To what extent do your present resources allow you to assist in the implementation of the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Always % | Usually % | Sometimes % | Not At All % | Not Applicable/ No Answer % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Leaders | 9 | 41 | 45 | - | 5 |
| Psychoeducational Consultants | 4 | 46 | 31 | - | 19 |
| Total | 6 | 44 | 38 | - | 12 |

(b) What additional skills, help and resources, if any, would assist you in your role in the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| More time | 2 | 7 | 9 (19%) |
| Better team work/more time to work with other support staff in a direct service approach to early intervention/more time and personnel for a systematic approach/ ongoing liaison between curriculum and special services staff | 2 | 2 | 4 (8%) |
| Workshops on Special Education Resource Book/Early Identification Procedures/early childhood education and review of current theories of growth and development from conception to 5 years/continual improvement in knowledge of strategies for improving behaviour and development | 3 | 1 | 4 (8%) |
| More refined skill in knowing how children behave/more opportunity to observe in classrooms as opposed to doing individual assessment | 1 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| Continuation of people resources such as Special Ed. resource teachers, more paraprofessional help | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Completion of new guidelines/adoption of a consistent policy and procedures throughout the schools | 1 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| Some schools are negligent in implementing Early I.D. Procedures; I would alter my schedule to attend meetings/if principals felt their time investment was worth it the procedures would be implemented | - | 2 | 2 (4%) |
| Other:<br>- Better community resources to help parents of potential problem students<br>- Being involved in initial screening committee<br>- A good teacher checklist<br>- Translators for languages not covered by Multiculturalism Unit/leaflets to explain procedures to immigrant parents in their native language; also materials on child development<br>- More frequent visits by speech and psycho-educational consultants<br>- More materials<br>- Time to examine the feasibility and value of an information processing approach to Early I.D. and intervention<br>- Special Services perspective of Early I.D. would be beneficial<br>- Don't know as I'm not really involved | | | 8 (17%) |
| No response | | | 20 (42%) |

TABLE 6

(a) In your opinion, how well do teachers and principals understand the concept of individualized programs for meeting the unique needs of students?

| | Extremely well/ Very well | | | Well | | | Not too well/ Not at all well | | | Not applicable | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % |
| Teachers | 32 | 35 | 33 | 36 | 38 | 38 | 40 | 19 | 33 | 5 | 15 | 10 |
| Principals | 32 | 42 | 32 | 32 | 35 | 33 | 55 | 15 | 35 | 5 | 15 | 10 |

Note: Percentages may total more than 100 as several respondents gave more than one answer.

(b) In your opinion, how well do teachers and principals apply the concept of individualized programs for meeting the unique needs of students?

| | Extremely well/ Very well | | | Well | | | Not too well/ Not at all well | | | Not applicable | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % | Prog. Ldrs. % | Psych. Cons. % | Total % |
| Teachers | 9 | 19 | 15 | 40 | 23 | 31 | 64 | 46 | 56 | 9 | 15 | 13 |
| Principals | 18 | 19 | 19 | 32 | 31 | 31 | 64 | 35 | 48 | 9 | 23 | 17 |

(c) What help and training do you think should be made available for teachers in order to help them better implement the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Program Leaders | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| P.D. workshops, e.g. on how children learn/ cognitive development of young children (Piaget, Erikson)/developmental psychology/ primary education/educational implications of developmental lags, signs of learning disability in children's play, ways of recording and monitoring key developmental skills/practical suggestions for program/ remediation techniques/training in assessing program to see how it isn't meeting student needs/observation techniques/ thinking skills/training in behavioural management/what to look for in all areas, including music, art and physical education | 16 | 16 | 32 (67%) |
| Need more human resources/supply teachers/ paraprofessionals/volunteers/gentle and understanding resource personnel for teachers | 5 | 3 | 8 (17%) |
| Lower PTR | 2 | 5 | 7 (15%) |
| Need more time/specific time for screening | 2 | 3 | 5 (10%) |
| Some teachers need change of attitude/need to have sympathy and understanding for those in need/need to be more flexible in programing for children's needs | 3 | 1 | 4 (8%) |
| More opportunity for discussion, sharing, visiting, planning together/shared input sessions/regular meetings with consultants for program modification guidance | 1 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| Need commitment by principals to follow procedure/need principals who can clearly articulate the what, why and how of Early I.D. | - | 2 | 2 (4%) |

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Expertise for implementation available but skill is lacking (or time) due to staffing squeezes and low morale/teachers must feel it is a necessary and good thing to be doing before they take it seriously/may be necessary to impose a more structured way of handling the issue | 1 | 1 | 2 (4%) |
| Most teachers already are aware and skilled | - | 2 | 2 (4%) |
| Other:<br>- JK and SK teachers should understand the process of learning a second language<br>- Need more funds<br>- Need greater support from everyone - parents, principals, peers - while attempting to implement new strategies<br>- System should move into second phase of implementation re Ministry Guidelines in uniform way | | | 6 (13%) |
| No response | | | 6 (13%) |

TABLE 7

How do you feel about the existing format of the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Program Leaders % | Psychoed. Consultants % | Total* % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Very satisfied/ somewhat satisfied | 18 | 8 | 13 |
| Satisfied | 36 | 35 | 35 |
| Dissatisfied/ very dissatisfied | 41 | 54 | 50 |
| No response | 9 | 12 | 10 |

* Percentages may total more than 100 as several respondents gave more than one answer.

TABLE 8

In your perception, how difficult is the task of implementing the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Program Leader % | Psychoed. Consultant % | Total % |
|---|---|---|---|
| Very easy to implement | - | 8 | 4 |
| Fairly easy to implement | 9 | 15 | 13 |
| Hard work but possible | 77 | 62 | 69 |
| A completely impossible task | - | 4 | 2 |
| No response | 14 | 12 | 13 |

TABLE 9

What impact has the implementation of Early Identification Procedures had on schools?

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Has raised awareness of principals and teachers of need for prevention/referrals of young children are more appropriate than in the past/staff more aware of need to check out children's basic sensory, motor and speech/language functions on school entry/teachers now look at stages of development vis-a-vis expectations/ more aware and acceptant of individual needs and differences | 4 | 7 | 11 (23%) |
| Generally very little/little impact on some schools/many of these procedures have been carried on for years | 5 | 4 | 9 (19%) |
| Don't know | 1 | 4 | 5 (10%) |
| Has created great deal of frustration and anxiety due to amount of time required and increased paper work/there is too much focus on teachers' inability to meet needs/ primary teachers are caught between this and their perception of curriculum/there is not enough time for other functions/ teachers are in bind about handling difficulties, programs, specific needs, very little positive reaction as people are confused and overwhelmed by the expectations | 3 | 2 | 5 (10%) |
| Variable impact depending on the interest, skill and enthusiasm of the teacher and principal | 1 | 4 | 5 (10%) |
| Conscientious effort to cater to needs of children at risk in the schools that are implementing it/very effective preventative measure/some schools using support personnel and program modification as soon as need arises | 2 | 2 | 4 (8%) |
| Takes too long to place pupils who are in need | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Increased demand on psychoeducational and Special Ed. support people | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |
| Other: | | | |
| - Early I.D. placement particularly helpful for children with behavioural problems/ younger children often return to regular grade whereas older children seldom do<br>- Teachers can share individual concerns with a supportive group of professionals<br>- Family of Schools uses specific review procedures/we have developed questionnaire for use by parents<br>- Teachers view procedure as a Board requirement and not as a vehicle for working with children and developing appropriate programs<br>- There is a preoccupation with children's weaknesses and removal from regular grades<br>- We're still not reaching immigrant children in an effective way<br>- It has confused them because of the mixed messages coming from different departments. In whose portfolio does Early I.D. belong?<br>- A lot of time has been expended on P.D. and developing procedures but I wonder how much has changed with respect to programing for individually identified children | | | 8 (17%) |
| No response | | | 4 (8%) |

TABLE 10

What changes, if any, would you recommend in the Early Identification Procedures?

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Need to establish clearer criteria and indicators of children who may be high risk/need more uniform approach and procedure/procedures should be compulsory/ re-define the rationale for the process and add objective components/update procedures and advertise them widely/teachers need clarification about which department is responsible - Special Services or Curriculum - they find it difficult to know who to follow | 7 | 6 | 13 (27%) |
| The procedures are okay but are we really achieving objectives/procedures not being implemented in my schools/need to ensure follow through/teachers need help in looking at all students differently/some schools more casual than others/schools may need encouragement to adopt a more comprehensive and effective approach/there is feeling that so few resources are available that Early I.D. results in little help/need to monitor procedures to ensure that they are carried out | 2 | 5 | 7 (15%) |
| Should involve other resource staff, e.g. Special Education, Speech, Language Program Leaders, Psychoeducational Consultants, Specialists in music, art, physical education | 3 | 2 | 5 (10%) |
| Should be less focus on formal identification and more on informal with program modification where needed/more emphasis on programing and goal setting/need ongoing identification and follow-up throughout year/ need to ensure follow-up for high risk cases/ problem not in identification but in applying remediation/should have systematic retrieval process | 1 | 5 | 6 (13%) |

| | Program Leaders # | Psychoed. Consultants # | Total # |
|---|---|---|---|
| Need P.D. on observation, program modification, regular ongoing evaluation of student needs, early childhood development for all educators to include understanding of how race, culture, socioeconomic and other environmental conditions cause differences/ bring principals and teachers on Board humanely and professionally on a sustained basis through workshops | 3 | 1 | 4 (8%) |
| Total commitment by principals, e.g. through performance review/principals need to develop more expertise to do the job with greater competence | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |
| Teachers should be encouraged to make observations on strategies children use in coping with educational and social problems/classroom observation and assistance from resource staff are needed as well as conferences | - | 2 | 2 (4%) |
| Materials and resources are needed/need practical package of support materials | 2 | - | 2 (4%) |
| Other: | | | |
| - Should give clear indication of assistance for children who don't speak English when they register in JK | | | |
| - Lower PTR | | | |
| - More clout for supervisory officers | | | |
| - More time should be allocated if this is high Board priority | | | |
| - Teachers need to realize there is no July miracle in a student's eighth year - between grade 3 and 4. How can this be addressed? | | | 7 (15%) |
| - What program? I haven't seen it or heard about it or been invited to take part in it. A specific program is needed. Are we talking about JK, SK or at any age level or grade? | | | |
| - I'm just too busy doing Early I.D. to answer this fully. I'm sorry but an evaluation like this gets the short end - an interview is better | | | |